DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 109 976 HE 006 662

AUTHOR Mortimer, Kenneth P.; Ross, Naomi V.
TITLE Faculty Voting Behavior in Temple University Collective Bargaining Elections.
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
PUB DATE Apr 75
NOTE 70p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Attitudes; *Collective Bargaining; *Collective Negotiation; Demography; *Faculty; Governance; *Higher Education; Labor Demands; Opinions; Professional Personnel; Strikes; Surveys; Tables (Data); *Teacher Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS *Temple University

ABSTRACT

This document reports on a survey of faculty voting behavior. The survey was months after a second election was held to determine whether or not faculty and support professionals at Temple University would be represented by a collective bargaining agent. The survey focused on the relationship between voting behavior and two potential sources of variance: (1) faculty characteristics; and (2) attitudes and/or opinions about several key issues in academic collective bargaining. The document is presented in four major sections. The first section discusses the national and local scene relative to collective bargaining, sets the context of the election, and specifies the methods and analytic techniques used in the research. The second section presents results of the survey pertaining to the first election held. The third section is similar to the second section but deals with the second or runoff election. Survey data presented in sections two and three include: (1) open-ended response by voting behavior; (2) demographic characteristics by voting behavior; (3) association descriptors; (4) internal versus external governance factors as influences on voting behavior; (5) satisfaction with and desired negotiability of issues; (6) attitude toward strikes by voting behavior; (7) the viability of "no representative"; (8) summary of election results. The fourth section discusses and summarizes major findings of the study. (Author/KE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED109976

Faculty Voting Behavior in the Temple University Collective Bargaining Elections

Kenneth P. Mortimer and
Naomi V. Ross
with the assistance of
Michael E. Shorr and
Cheryl Toronyi

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Center for the Study of
Higher Education

The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

April 1975

HE 006662

CONTENTS

List of Tables v

Acknowledgments vii

Introduction 1

I. **The Context of the Election** 3
The Growth of Faculty Collective Bargaining 3
Collective Bargaining in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania 5
Temple University 6
The Unit Determination Process at Temple 7
The Design and Methods of the Study 9

II. **The First Election** 11
The Open-Ended Responses by Voting Behavior 11
Demographic Characteristics by Voting Behavior 13
Association Descriptors 14
Internal Versus External Governance Factors as Influences on Voting Behavior 17
Satisfaction with and Desired Negotiability of Six Issues 19
Attitude Toward Strikes by Voting Behavior 20
The Viability of "No Representative" 21
Summary of First Election Results 22

III. **The Runoff Election** 23
The Open-Ended Responses by Voting Behavior 23
Demographic Characteristics by Voting Behavior 24
Association Descriptors 25
Internal Versus External Governance Factors as Influences on Voting Behavior 25
Satisfaction with Potentially Bargainable Issues 26
Negotiability or Importance of Potentially Bargainable Issues 26

Attitude Toward Strikes by Voting Behavior 26
Summary of Runoff Election Results 27

IV. **Voting Behavior in Both Elections for Those Who Voted in Both** 28
Vote Switching in the Second Election 28
NEA Voters Compared by Voting Behavior in the Second Election 28
Demographic Characteristics by Voting Behavior 29
Association Descriptors 29
Internal Versus External Governance Factors as Influences on Voting Behavior 29
Satisfaction with Potentially Bargainable Issues 30
Negotiability or Importance of Potentially Bargainable Issues 30
Attitude Toward Strikes by Voting Behavior 30

V. **Discussion and Summary** 31
Demographic Characteristics by Voting Behavior 31
Association Descriptors 31
Internal Versus External Governance Factors as Influences on Voting Behavior 32
Satisfaction with and Desired Negotiability of Six Issues 32
Attitude Toward Strikes 33
Chance of No Rep to Win 34
Generalizations Across Elections 34

Appendix A: Tables 37

References 61

List of Tables

Table 1.	Temple University Collective Bargaining Election Results	39
2.	Distribution of the Population Compared to the Respondents on Whether a Vote Was Cast in the Two Elections at Temple University	39
3.	Distribution of the Population's Voting Behavior Compared to Respondent Voting Behavior in Two Temple University Elections	40
4.	Analysis of Variance of Mean Ages by Voting Behavior	40
5.	Analysis of Variance of Mean Years of Service at Other Institutions of Higher Education by Voting Behavior	41
6.	Crosstabulation of Academic Affiliation and Voting Behavior	41
7.	Percentage of Respondents Indicating the Association Which Best Exemplifies Each of Eight General Characteristics	42
8.	Crosstabulation of Faculty Selection of Most Prestigious Association and Voting Behavior	42
9.	Crosstabulation of Faculty Selection of Most Union-Oriented Association and Voting Behavior	43
10.	Crosstabulation of Faculty Selection of Most Professionally Oriented Association and Voting Behavior	43
11.	Crosstabulation of Faculty Selection of Historical Commitment to Collective Bargaining Association and Voting Behavior	44
12.	Crosstabulation of Faculty Selection of Greatest National Visibility Association and Voting Behavior	44
13.	Crosstabulation of Faculty Selection of Greatest Visibility Within Pennsylvania Association and Voting Behavior	45
14.	Crosstabulation of Faculty Selection of Least Likely to Resort to Strike Association and Voting Behavior	45
15.	Crosstabulation of Faculty Selection of Greatest Lobbying Potential in Harrisburg Association and Voting Behavior	45
16.	Analysis of Variance of Ranked Statements Expressing Respondent Attitudes about Internal vs. External Governance Influences upon Their Vote by Voting Behavior	46
17.	Post Hoc Comparison of Ranked Statements Expressing Respondent Attitudes about Internal vs. External Governance Influences upon Their Vote	47
18.	Analysis of Variance of Potential Collective Bargaining Issues Ranked from Most to Least Satisfied by Voting Behavior	48
19.	Analysis of Variance of Potentially Negotiable Issues Ranked from Most to Least Important or Negotiable by Voting Behavior	48
20.	Analysis of Variance of Ranked Statements Expressing Respondent Attitudes about Faculty Use of the Strike by Voting Behavior	49
21.	Post Hoc Comparison of Ranked Statements Expressing Respondent Attitudes about Faculty Use of the Strike	50
22.	Answers to the Question: Would You Have Voted for the No Representative Option If You Thought It Had a Chance to Win? by Voting Behavior	50
23.	Analysis of Variance of Mean Age by Voting Behavior in the Second Election	51
24.	Crosstabulation of Tenure and Voting Behavior in the Second Election	51
25.	Crosstabulation of Eight Association Characteristics with Voting Behavior in the Second Election	52
26.	Analysis of Variance of Ranked Statements Expressing Respondent Attitudes about Internal vs. External Governance Influences upon Their Vote by Voting Behavior in the Second Election	53

27. Analysis of Variance of Potential Collective Bargaining Issues Ranked from Most to Least Satisfied by Voting Behavior in the Second Election 54
28. Analysis of Variance of Potentially Negotiable Issues Ranked from Most to Least Important or Negotiable by Voting Behavior in the Second Election 54
29. Analysis of Variance of Ranked Statements Expressing Respondent Attitudes about Faculty Use of the Strike by Voting Behavior in the Second Election 55
30. Crosstabulation of Voting Behavior in the First and Second Elections for Those Who Voted in Both Elections 55
31. Crosstabulation of Eight Association Characteristics of FCBA-NEA Voters Who Voted in the Second Election by Voting Behavior 56
32. Analysis of Variance of Ranked Statements Expressing FCBA-NEA Voter Attitudes about Internal vs. External Governance Influences upon Their Vote by Voting Behavior in the Second Election 57
33. Analysis of Variance of Potential Collective Bargaining Issues Ranked from Most to Least Satisfied by FCBA-NEA Voters by Their Voting Behavior in the Second Election 58
34. Analysis of Variance of Ranked Statements Expressing FCBA-NEA Voter Attitudes about Faculty Use of the Strike by Their Voting Behavior in the Second Election 59

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge the assistance of Michael E. Shorr in the collection of data for the study reported in this monograph and Cheryl Toronyi, Center statistician, for her assistance in the analysis of the data collected.

INTRODUCTION

On October 24 and 25, 1972, the faculty and support professionals of Temple University went to the polls to determine whether or not they would be represented by a collective bargaining agent.[1] The results were as follows: No representation—183, Faculty Collective Bargaining Association (FCBA)-Pennsylvania State Education Association (PSEA)-National Education Association (NEA)—280, American Association of University Professors (AAUP), Temple University Chapter—303, and Temple University Faculty Federation (TUFF)-American Federation of Teachers (AFT)—328.

The election results showed conclusively that an agent would be chosen, but no one of the four voting options was sufficiently strong to win the required majority on the first ballot. Thus, on December 6 and 7, 1972, the faculty and support professionals returned to the polls to choose between the AAUP and AFT, the top two finishers in the first election. In the second or runoff election, the AAUP was chosen as the exclusive representative of the entire bargaining unit. The election results were as follows: AAUP—676, AFT—437. (See Table 1 in Appendix A for a detailed breakdown of election figures.)

This monograph reports on a survey of faculty voting behavior conducted during the winter of 1973, a few months after the second election. The research is a replication of a previous study in the Pennsylvania State College and University system and studies the relationship between voting behavior and two potential sources of variance: (1) faculty characteristics and (2) attitudes and/or opinions about several key issues in academic collective bargaining (Lozier and Mortimer 1974).

This report is presented in four major sections. The first section discusses the national and local scene relative to collective bargaining, sets the context of the Temple election, and specifies the methods and analytic techniques used in the research. The second section pre-

[1] At the time of the Temple election, there were approximately 199 faculty bargaining units, representing 288 separate campuses and 80,000 faculty and nonteaching professionals (Aussieker and Garbarino 1973, pp. 119-20). These figures are impressive when compared to the five campuses and 2,600 individuals represented by bargaining agents in 1966.

sents the results of the survey as they pertain to the first election held in October 1972. The third section is similar to the second but deals with the second or runoff election held in December 1972. The fourth section of this report discusses and summarizes the major findings of the study.

I: THE CONTEXT OF THE ELECTION

The Growth of Faculty Collective Bargaining

The number of campuses with duly recognized collective bargaining agents has grown from 5 in 1966 to 338 at the end of the 1973–74 academic year (Aussieker and Garbarino 1973, p. 120; The *Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 10, 1974, p. 24). Because many of the institutions with faculty bargaining agents are of a multicampus nature, the total number of bargaining units is only 228. Approximately 61 percent (205) of the 338 campuses or 69 percent (155) of the 228 bargaining units are two-year community or junior colleges, and all but 4 of them are publicly supported. In fact, faculty collective bargaining is a phenomenon which appears largely in public institutions: only 41 private campuses have unionized faculties.

While the incidence of collective bargaining is spread throughout 27 states and the District of Columbia, 310 (92 percent) of the 338 unionized campuses are located in 14 states: New York (88), Michigan (34), New Jersey (32), Pennsylvania (28), Washington (23), Illinois (21), Minnesota (18), Wisconsin (18), Massachusetts (16), Kansas (8), Hawaii (8), Maine (6), Connecticut (5), and Rhode Island (5).

Changes in the legal environment have been crucial to the spread of faculty collective bargaining in postsecondary education. In 1970 the National Labor Relations Board extended the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act to private colleges and universities with gross revenues of over one million. This ruling covers 85 percent of the nation's approximately 1,500 private postsecondary colleges and universities. Faculties in public institutions gain bargaining rights through a variety of state and/or municipal bargaining statutes.

According to Emmet (1974, p. 2), at the end of the 1973–74 academic year, 20 states had some type of formal statute that covered employees in postsecondary institutions. In 5 or 6 of these, the provisions did not cover teaching staff, only staff employees. Of the 30 states without some form of postsecondary enabling legislation, 27 have had legislative activity in this area since 1970. Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina were the 3 states without such activity. Begin (1974, p. 79) has demonstrated the importance of enabling

legislation to unionization efforts. His data show that in the 5 states of New York, Michigan, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts, 79 percent of the eligible institutions have been organized since the passage of enabling legislation. The single greatest predictor of the growth of collective bargaining continues to be whether or not there is an enabling statute.

Laws governing collective bargaining normally accomplish three important things. First, the statute guarantees public employees the right to organize for purposes of collective bargaining and protects them in the exercise of this right. The employer is normally prohibited from taking any punitive action against the employee who is exercising this right. There is some legal disagreement about whether the right to organize is guaranteed by the federal constitution. This legal debate is satisfied by the passage of an enabling act.

The right to organize has little meaning without the second major accomplishment of a collective bargaining act—the requirement that management bargain in "good faith" and sign a legally binding agreement embodying the product of that good faith bargaining. The term "bargain in good faith" has a technical meaning which is enforceable in a court of law. Both sides must hear the arguments presented by the other, although neither side has to agree. The basic point is that proposals and counterproposals must be made until an agreement is reached on bargainable items.

The third major accomplishment of most collective bargaining legislation is to create a public employee relations board or commission to administer the provision of the act. The board or commission has the authority to hold hearings to determine appropriate bargaining units, the existence or nonexistence of unfair labor practices, and, in some cases, to determine mediation, impasse, and arbitration awards. Normally, the board's decisions are binding on both parties, although they may be appealed to the courts.

A final point concerning national developments and the trend towards collective bargaining with faculty; evidence indicates that the growth rate of collective bargaining is beginning to slow down. Begin (1974, p. 75) showed that the peak years for the formation of faculty bargaining units were 1970, 1971, and 1972 and that the number of new faculty bargaining units declined in 1973. The research of Mortimer et al. (1974), which traced the number of institutions in which the faculty rejected collective bargaining, supports the slowdown theory with evidence of the number of rejections of a bargaining agent.

Of the 105 elections in four-year colleges and universities at the end of 1973-74, 28 resulted in no representative victories. Twenty of these 28 elections occurred in the last two academic years. Apparently, then, the passage of enabling legislation leads to a spurt in the growth of unionized institutions in the two years immediately following the passage of the act. It may be that the heavily industrialized states where collective bargaining started have reached the saturation point.

On the other hand, some major states are now in the process of considering collective bargaining laws which would apply to postsecondary faculty. The Florida legislature has passed an act which will go into effect in 1975. The California legislature's 1974 enabling act, vetoed by Governor Reagan, may revive in a revised form because the new governor is apparently committed to some form of public employee legislation. An increased spurt in the growth of collective bargaining in postsecondary education in California and in other states is, therefore, likely as more states pass enabling legislation.

Collective Bargaining in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

The organization of faculties in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania closely parallels the national scene. In 1970, the Pennsylvania Legislature passed the Pennsylvania Public Employee's Relations Act (Act 195). Act 195 guarantees the faculty in public institutions in Pennsylvania the right to organize and requires management to bargain in good faith with duly constituted bargaining agents. In that same year, the National Labor Relations Board ruled that all private higher education institutions with gross revenues of over $1 million are subject to the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. Nearly all postsecondary institutions in Pennsylvania, then, became eligible for organization at approximately the same time.[2]

[2]The structure of public higher education in Pennsylvania is as follows: former state teacher's colleges are financed entirely by the state and are managed by the Pennsylvania Department of Education. The 14 community colleges receive one-third of their operating budgets from the state. Four other institutions are called state-related because they receive a major portion of their budgets from the state: The Pennsylvania State University, The University of Pittsburgh, Temple University, and Lincoln University. Fourteen other institutions receive direct state aid.

Since 1970, 11 of the 14 community colleges in Pennsylvania have chosen collective bargaining agents. In 1971, the fourteen-campus Pennsylvania State College and University system elected an affiliate of the National Education Association to represent them. Temple University and Lincoln University have chosen the American Association of University Professors as their bargaining agent. Moore College of Art in Philadelphia and Robert Morris College in Pittsburgh bargain with the American Federation of Teachers. The administration of the University of Scranton bargains with the faculty under a special informal arrangement. Five private institutions—Philadelphia College of Art, Seton Hill, Point Park College, King's College, and Villanova University—have had elections; but the faculty have chosen not to adopt collective bargaining.

Organizing activity began in fall 1974 at The University of Pittsburgh and The Pennsylvania State University. The University of Pittsburgh engaged in unit determination hearings, while a card-signing campaign was being conducted at Penn State. It is likely that an election will be ordered at The University of Pittsburgh for either the spring or fall of 1975.

Temple University

Temple University was founded as a private university in 1888 and was largely sponsored by Baptist churches who hoped to offer evening courses for young men, otherwise employed, who aspired to the ministry. In 1891, Temple opened its doors to women, conferred its first degrees, and, in 1893, began to offer day classes. It was not until 1908, however, that Temple was recognized by national professional associations as a university. By then it had schools of theology, law, pharmacy, medicine, and dentistry. Temple remained a private institution until 1965 when, facing severe financial difficulties, it became a state-related institution, thereby gaining expectations of annual appropriations from the legislature. Under this arrangement, Temple retains its own governing board but is a public employer as defined under Act 195.

Today Temple University consists of four campuses, all located in Philadelphia and its near suburbs. Serving a student body of approximately 37,000, it employs approximately 1,400 faculty and support professionals, exclusive of administrative staff. Temple enjoys some

prestige within the higher education community in Pennsylvania, since it was one of the seven Pennsylvania institutions mentioned in the Roose-Anderson (1970) report about the 150 most prestigious graduate institutions in the country (see also Millman and Toombs 1972).

Interest in collective bargaining at Temple dates back at least to the spring of 1971 (Semas 1972, pp. 1, 3; Katz 1974, pp. 29-31). At that time, the faculty senate's committee on salaries resigned after a dispute with the President, Dr. Paul Anderson. The committee, in resigning, recommended that the faculty begin collective bargaining. Whether pre-planned, as some administrators claimed, or not, the matter of collective bargaining was actively discussed at that time.

The Unit Determination Process at Temple

On June 3, 1971, the Faculty Collective Bargaining Association (FCBA [then independent but later affiliated with the Pennsylvania State Education Association]) filed a petition with the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board (PLRB) to represent all full-time faculty members at Temple. On June 9, the Temple Law School Professor's Collective Bargaining Association filed a petition to represent all full-time faculty in the law school. Subsequently, the local chapters of the American Association of University Professors and the American Federation of Teachers intervened on the FCBA petition, each seeking its own representative status and each claiming a slightly different bargaining unit. Finally, the Temple University Medical School Faculty Committee and the Temple University Dental School Faculty Committee were permitted to intervene on the FCBA petition for the purpose of urging that the medical and dental faculty be excluded from any unit found appropriate for collective bargaining (Election Order 1972, p. 1).

A series of hearings were conducted before a hearing officer commencing on October 7, 1971, and ending on April 21, 1972. During these hearings the Temple administration argued for a comprehensive unit of all full-time faculty at Temple, including law, medicine, and dentistry, and for the exclusion of department chairpersons from the bargaining unit. The administration argued that department chairpersons were supervisory employees under the meaning of Act 195. None of these administrative positions was sustained.

On August 11, 1972, the PLRB issued an election order for the following units (Election Order 1971, pp. 12-13):

Unit I – a subdivision of the employer unit comprised of all full-time faculty, including department chairmen employed at Temple University, including professional librarians on the Paley Library budget, librarians in the School of Social Administration, the College of Education, and the College of Allied Health Professions; counselors and academic advisors at the College of Liberal Arts, Counseling Center, and Student Resources Center; supervisors of practice teaching at the College of Education; nonfaculty support professionals in the intern teaching program for college graduates; other support professionals who meet the definition of being necessary or adjunct to the teaching of students or research projects of the University, excluding the faculty at Rome, Italy, and the faculty at the Medical School, Law School, and Dental School and the Hospital, and further excluding all other nonfaculty and professional employees, computer personnel, management, supervisors, first level supervisors, and confidential employees as defined in Act 195.

Unit II – a subdivision of the employer unit comprised of Temple University Law School, including all professors of law, associate professors of law, assistant professors of law, adjunct professors of law, and all law librarians as support professionals necessary to the teaching of law, and excluding management, supervisors, first level supervisors, and confidential employees as defined in Act 195.

The elections took place in October and December of 1972, with the Unit I results as indicated on page one of this report. Unit II, the law school, elected an independent agent, The Temple Law School Professors' Collective Bargaining Association. The Unit II election is not a subject of investigation in this report.

After the elections, the Temple administration filed an exception to the above ruling with the PLRB. On July 3, 1973, the Board of Trustees reaffirmed the separate law school unit, the exclusion of the medical and dental faculties from any unit and the inclusion of department chairpersons in Unit I. Contract bargaining with the AAUP began soon after, although contract demands were not placed on the table until December, 1973. A contract eventually was ratified by AAUP membership in September, 1974. Thus, a full three years elapsed from the date a representative petition was filed until a contract was ratified.

The Design and Methods of the Study

The research reported here was conducted by using two major data sources: (1) campaign literature, secondary source material on the collective bargaining situation at Temple, and PLRB decisions; and (2) a mailed questionnaire. Selected campaign literature and newspaper and journal articles provided useful background material and were a valuable source of cross-checks on the questionnaire data.

In the winter of 1972, a questionnaire was mailed to a random sample of 678 of the 1,398 individuals in the bargaining unit (see Table 2, Appendix A). Three separate mailings resulted in a usable response rate of 56 percent, although not all returns were usable for every question.

The instrument consisted of 25 separate questions, 3 of which required open-ended responses. Ten questions required the respondent to list demographic characteristics as follows: rank; type of assignment (e.g., faculty, librarian, department chairman); tenure status; sex; age; employment status (e.g., full-time, part-time, temporary); academic department; number of institution-wide committees served on; number of college-wide committees served on; number of years teaching experience in elementary and/or secondary schools; years of continuous service at Temple; and years of service at other institutions of higher education. Seven questions ascertained whether the respondent had voted or not, how the respondent voted or would have voted, and whether or not the respondent voted or would have voted for "No Representative" if he or she thought that option had a chance to win. The remaining questions asked the respondents to characterize the associations involved in the elections; to rank several statements according to the importance they had for the respondents in choosing an agent; to rank their priorities regarding satisfaction with certain issues and their desire to have those same issues negotiated; and, finally, to rank the extent of their agreement with four statements regarding strikes.

Statistical analysis of sampling distributions and of the data collected to test research hypotheses employed three different procedures: chi-square tests of statistical independence; chi-square tests of hypothetical proportions; and analysis of variance. In statistically significant cases, additional follow-up procedures (a chi-square analog to Scheffe's Theorem and the Tukey WSD test) were used to analyze

further and identify more specifically the source of these statistical significances. A standard alpha of 0.05 was adopted as the significance level for all tests. Since the computerized programs used allowed for reading over missing data, values for missing data were not supplied and the sample size n for each test varied according to the rate of response for a particular questionnaire item.

The statistical analyses were computed to determine whether differences that could be associated with voting behavior existed. A series of hypotheses were framed about each variable according to voting behavior. The following is an illustration of a null hypothesis.

> There is no difference in the mean ages of those who voted for the various options on the ballot (H_0: $\bar{X}_{NEA} = \bar{X}_{AAUP} = \bar{X}_{AFT} = \bar{X}_{No\ Rep}$).

In order to estimate the extent to which the questionnaire respondents were representative of the entire bargaining unit, statistical tests were performed comparing the characteristics of the two groups (see Tables 2 and 3). There were no significant differences ($p = .05$) between members of the bargaining unit who voted and the respondents who voted on the variables of voting behavior (Table 3) and sex (data not in the Appendix). On the other hand, significantly fewer of those who did not vote in the election answered the survey (see Table 2). The data in the survey reported here are representative of those who voted in the two elections.

Great caution should be used if inferences to the entire bargaining unit membership are desired from these data.

II: THE FIRST ELECTION

The Open-Ended Responses by Voting Behavior

The main concern of this report is to analyze voting behavior in elections rather than to chronicle the progress of the campaign in any detail. Nevertheless, campaign literature and the open-ended questions at the end of the survey instrument do provide insights into the campaign. As it happens, the data here support the accuracy of other accounts of the campaign (Semas 1972; Katz 1974).

The open-ended questions in the instrument were as follows: (1) In your view, what was the major issue in the first election? (2) In your view what was the major issue in the second election? and (3) Please use the space below for any other comments you would like to make regarding the election.[3] The following is a summary of the responses to question 1, arranged by voting behavior.

Issue in the First Election

Did Not Vote. Of 15 responses, 4 reported that the election was a question of who got power, 3 thought that professionalism was the issue, 3 thought that it was a question of whether or not the Temple faculty should engage in collective bargaining, and 2 thought the issue was money.

No Representation. Of the 33 responses, the largest group (10 or 30 percent) said the major issue was a question of whether or not the Temple faculty would engage in collective bargaining. Four said this would have been the issue except that it was obvious No Rep would lose. (When the Temple newspaper wanted to print the No Rep side with the others, it was almost unable to find someone to speak for it.) Four others said collective bargaining was a reaction against the administration, with two naming the president in particular. Other com-

[3] Of a total of 390 returned, usable questionnaires, 206 answered the first question, 181 answered the second question, and 61 answered the third. The responses summarized here are for question one only. Questions two and three will be discussed later when appropriate.

ments ranged from "No one knew" to "the inadequacy of trade-union models."

AAUP. Of 59 responses, 32 (54 percent) said that collective bargaining per se was the issue (3 said No Rep would clearly not win) and 4 expressed it in such terms as "the right of the Temple faculty to control its own destiny." Another group of 6 claimed that the professionalism of the agent was the main issue, while 4 others claimed that the issue was who was least likely to strike. Four also thought that money was an issue, with 1 calling the issue greed and another saying it was fear of not getting a fair share. Regarding opposing groups, 2 said the AFT was too radical and 1 said the issue was to remove the "in-house" union, presumably referring to the senate.

NEA. Of 44 responses, again the largest group (17 or 39 percent) said the issue was whether to bargain collectively, with 1 mentioning that No Rep was not a viable choice. The next largest group (5) again mentioned opposition to the administration and the president. Four said the issue was money (1 mentioned women's salaries in particular). Comments on opposing groups ranged from "sibling rivalry" to the comment by 3 respondents that the main issue was who was least likely to strike.

AFT. The 55 AFT voters who answered this question were not nearly so united in claiming the importance of collective bargaining per se as the main issue. One group (n = 10) ranked salary inequities as the main issue and another (n = 10) claimed the question was which group would most effectively represent faculty views. There were 7 who said collective bargaining was the issue, while 6 claimed the question was the faculty's organized participation in university affairs. Equal numbers (4) thought that there was reaction to the administration and the president or that there was fear of a labor image. In commenting on opposing groups, one person said he thought AAUP would lose and the question would be whether NEA or AFT could be the better bargainer.

The AFT supporters tended to be more diffuse in their identification of the issues. The question of whether to adopt collective bargaining itself was the major issue to 66 of 191 voters (34 percent) who answered this question. AFT voters were less concerned about this matter (7 of 55 responses or 13 percent) than were NEA (39 percent) and AAUP (54 percent) voters. Opposition to the administration and the president seems also to have been important, along with

salaries and the developing images of the various groups. (The viability of the no representative option will be discussed later in this report.)

Demographic Characteristics by Voting Behavior

The demographic characteristics of respondents who voted for the four options were compared. Of the 10 characteristics specified earlier in this report, only 3 showed statistically significant differences according to voting behavior. Two, academic affiliation and age, have proved significant in other studies of attitude, such as that of Moore (1970, p. 34) and Lozier and Mortimer (1974, pp. 24–27). The third, number of years at other institutions of higher education, reflects a pattern similar to that of age.

Age. The mean age of those respondents voting for the AFT (38.6 years) proved to be significantly lower than the mean age of those voting for both NEA (42.9 years) and AAUP (42.6 years). The mean age for No Rep voters (39.3 years) was closest to AFT voters, but the follow-up test showed it was not significantly different from any other group mean (see Table 4).[4]

Service at Other Institutions of Higher Education. The significant contrasts on this variable were between No Rep voters (2.05 years) and those who voted for the NEA (4.16 years) and AAUP (4.46 years). No Rep voters had the least amount of experience in other colleges and universities, although the contrast with AFT voters (2.76 years) was not significant (see Table 5).

Academic Affiliation. Respondents from various schools and colleges were categorized into one of six academic areas: arts-humanities, business, education, sciences, social sciences, and library and/or offices. Table 6 shows that the resulting chi-square test was significant. None of the subsequent post hoc contrasts proved significant. However, some interesting relationships are apparent from these data.

If one assumes that "consensus" exists if 60 to 65 percent of the voters agree, the following facts are relevant. Two-thirds of the

[4] In all cases where there were violations of the assumption of homogeneous population variances, a Behrens-Fischer "T"-test was employed. All significant contrasts were confirmed by this test.

arts-humanities voters chose either the NEA or the AAUP, a clear rejection of the other two choices. Approximately 64 percent of the business and education voters chose either the AFT or the NEA, whereas 64 percent of voters in the sciences chose either No Rep or the AAUP.

No such "neat" generalizations are apparent from voting behavior of those in the social science and library categories, however. Sixty-five percent of voters in the social sciences voted for either the AFT or No Rep, whereas 75 percent of the library group voted for either the AAUP or the AFT. This tends to suggest a more heterogeneous set of views within these two categories than within the other four. Other explanations of these data should include an exploration of the integrity of the categories themselves as well as the nature of the perceptions of subgroups of faculty about the national and local associations. The general characteristics of the national associations is the subject of the next section of this report.

Association Descriptors

This question was designed to determine what, if any, relationship existed between the way people perceived the organizations and the way they voted. Eight descriptors were provided, and respondents were asked to check the association they thought best fit the descriptor. The intention was to see which organization fit which descriptor (there was, in fact, generally high agreement on five of the eight descriptors), and to see if there were statistically significant differences in the descriptors between those who voted for the various options. The eight descriptors were as follows: most prestigious, most union-oriented, most professionally oriented, historical commitment to collective bargaining, greatest national visibility, greatest visibility within Pennsylvania, least likely to resort to a strike, and greatest lobbying potential in Harrisburg (see Table 7).

Table 7 shows a high degree of consensus that certain descriptors were most indicative of certain associations. The AAUP was judged the most prestigious (89.8 percent), most professionally oriented (84.1 percent), and least likely to strike (78.9 percent). The AFT was judged the most union-oriented (94.2 percent) and historically committed to collective bargaining (83.6 percent).

Another general consensus which emerged from these data was that the NEA affiliate at Temple (FCBA) had no clear image. Not one of the eight descriptors was perceived by a majority of the Temple respondents to be associated with the NEA. The highest percentage figure achieved by the FCBA was the 43.6 accorded to it as the association with the greatest lobbying potential in Harrisburg. Even on this descriptor, however, the NEA affiliate ran second to the AFT's 47.3 percent.

Most Prestigious. Significantly more AAUP voters (98.9 percent) checked this as characteristic of the AAUP than did NEA and AFT voters (see Table 8). Although consensus on this descriptor was high, about 17 percent of the NEA voters perceived their association to be more prestigious than did either AAUP or AFT voters, whereas only 8.8 percent of the AFT voters felt the AFT was most prestigious.

Most Union-Oriented. There was no significant disagreement, according to voting behavior, on which association fit this descriptor (see Table 9).

Most Professionally Oriented. Significant differences occurred between AAUP voters and NEA and AFT voters, with AAUP voters checking AAUP significantly (95.7 percent vs. 70.1 and 78.8 percent for NEA and AFT voters, respectively) more often than the others did (see Table 10). NEA and AFT voters checked NEA or AFT significantly more often than AAUP voters checked those options. NEA voters also differed significantly from No Rep voters: No Rep voters checked AAUP significantly more often than did NEA voters and NEA voters checked NEA or AFT significantly more often than did No Rep voters.

Historical Commitment to Collective Bargaining. The significant differences show AFT voters (94.9 percent) checking AFT significantly more often than did NEA (80.0 percent) and AAUP (76.8 percent) voters. In contrast, significantly more NEA and AAUP voters than AFT voters checked AAUP or NEA (see Table 11).

These differences seem to indicate that AFT voters tended to think this a characteristic of their organization significantly more often than did NEA and AAUP voters. NEA and AAUP voters who disagreed with the general consensus tended to favor their own association.

Greatest National Visibility. Significantly more AFT voters (70.4 percent) than NEA voters (36.7 percent) and AAUP voters (41.5

percent) checked AFT as the association with the greatest national visibility (see Table 12). The fact that the other voters showed no consensus on this descriptor demonstrates that greatest national visibility was not clearly an image of any one organization in this election.

Greatest Visibility Within Pennsylvania. On this descriptor, significant contrasts occurred with those checking NEA and with those checking AFT. In this case, significantly more NEA voters (54.8 percent) than AFT voters (25.8 percent) checked NEA. Conversely, significantly more AFT voters (69.9 percent) than NEA voters (34.2 percent) and AAUP voters (39.0 percent) checked AFT (see Table 13).

Clearly, the rivalry here was between AFT and NEA, with AAUP voters tending slightly to favor the NEA. The high proportion (69.9 percent) of AFT voters who checked the AFT indicates a high degree of consensus among them compared to only a slight majority (54.8 percent) of NEA voters who regarded the NEA as having the most visibility in Pennsylvania.

Least Likely to Strike. There were no significant contrasts, according to voting behavior, on this descriptor (see Table 14).

Greatest Lobbying Potential in Harrisburg. The significant differences occurred between those who checked the NEA and those who checked the AFT (see Table 15). NEA voters (68.9 percent) checked NEA significantly more often than did AAUP (54.2 percent) and AFT (20.0 percent) voters. AFT voters checked AFT significantly more often than NEA, AAUP, and No Rep voters (78.9, 20.0, and 1.1 percent respectively).

Apparently, lobbying potential in Harrisburg was significantly associated with voting behavior. Table 15 shows a consensus among NEA voters (68.9 percent) that their association had the greatest lobbying potential in the state capital and that a higher degree of consensus (78.9 percent) existed among AFT voters that their association had this potential. As reported earlier, there was no overall consensus on this descriptor.

The summary data on these eight descriptors produce a relatively clear picture of the association images. There was consensus that the AAUP was most prestigious, most professionally oriented, and least likely to resort to a strike. The AFT was most union-oriented and had the greatest historical commitment to collective bargaining.

On six of eight descriptors there were statistically significant differences according to voting behavior. In every significant case, the AFT and AAUP voters were different from each other. In only two cases were the No Rep voters significantly different from another group: they differed from the NEA voters on the descriptor, most professionally oriented, and from the AFT voters on the question of greatest lobbying potential in Harrisburg. In no case were No Rep voters significantly different from AAUP voters. In seven of the eight descriptors (greatest national visibility was the exception), the NEA came in second; and, in every place except national visibility, where it strongly contended with AFT, it tended to receive support from AAUP voters. According to these data, AFT and AAUP tended to have clear images and to be in contrast with one another. The NEA had no clear image in this election.

Internal Versus External Governance Factors as Influences on Voting Behavior

Respondents were asked to rank six statements according to how influential each statement was in their selection of a bargaining agent.[5] The statements were intended to determine whether faculty voting behavior was influenced more by internal or external factors. The specific statements appear in rank order in Table 16.

From this table, the conclusion can be drawn that Temple faculty were relatively more concerned about internal rather than external factors as influences on their vote. Statements like "Temple's president and board of trustees have not responded to the needs and welfare of the faculty," and "The administrative staff have far too much authority" were ranked as more influential than statements such as "The state government and legislature have not responded to faculty needs," or "The association I voted for can best represent faculty interests in the state capital."

Of the six statements, four showed significant differences according to voting behavior. Each of these is reported below with the order of ranking in parentheses (see Table 17 for details).

(1) Internal agents such as Temple's president and board of trustees have not responded to the needs and welfare of the Temple

[5] Ranking was from most influential (1) to least influential (6).

faculty. This statement received the highest mean ranking and the AFT voters ranked it significantly more influential than did No Rep voters.

(2) The administrative staff at Temple have far too much authority in the affairs which should be determined by the faculty. No Representative voters differed significantly both from AAUP and AFT voters. No Rep voters ranked this statement as less influential than did either AAUP or AFT voters.

(4) The association I voted for can best represent faculty interests in the state legislature and state government. The statement uncovered several significant differences. No Rep and AAUP voters said this was less influential than did NEA and AFT voters. No Rep and AAUP voters were not, however, significantly different from each other.

The relative lack of influence attributed to this statement by AAUP voters corresponds with the earlier impression that the AAUP was weak on lobbying potential at the state level. It also supports the hypothesis that on the matter of lobbying potential in Harrisburg, the NEA supporters felt NEA was strong and were disposed to think of lobbying potential as highly influential in their vote.

(5) Greater attention should be given to means other than collective bargaining for faculty self-government and sharing of decision making with Temple's president and board of trustees. Here AFT voters were quite adamant, rating it of so little importance that they disagreed significantly with every other group. In addition, NEA voters once again were next to AFT, disagreeing significantly with No Rep voters. It would seem that No Rep voters ranked this of great importance because they were not clearly resigned to collective bargaining. AAUP voters were not significantly different from No Rep voters on this point.

The sum of the results of this section is that Temple faculty were more concerned about internal authority problems than about relations with state government. These data support the idea that there was a spectrum of opinion, reflected in voting behavior, ranging from No Representative on one end to the AFT on the other. The NEA voters appear closer to AFT and the AAUP voters appear closer to No Rep voters on most of the issues raised in this section.

Satisfaction with and Desired Negotiability of Six Issues

Two separate questions on the instrument sought to discover the relative degree of faculty satisfaction with six issues and the relative importance attached to whether or not they should be negotiated. Respondents were asked to rank each issue from most satisfied (1) to least satisfied (6), and, in a second question, from definitely should be negotiated or most important (1) to definitely should not be negotiated or least important (6).

Satisfaction. Table 18 shows the mean rankings attached to each issue. Academic freedom was most satisfactory, followed by determination of educational policy, conditions of employment, faculty personnel policies, financial benefits, and faculty participation in governance.

The mean rankings showed no statistically significant differences on these six issues according to voting behavior. Apparently the faculty were of essentially one mind about their relative satisfaction with these six issues.

Negotiability. Faculty rated financial benefits as the item which most definitely should be negotiated (see Table 19). Conditions of employment and faculty personnel policies were second and third, respectively, while faculty participation in governance was fourth. This latter is something of a surprise in view of the faculty's dissatisfaction with it. The ranking might be an indication that they do not think collective bargaining should be involved in governance matters. More likely, it is a reflection of the forced choice nature of the methodology: e.g., faculty participation in governance should be negotiated but it was less important than other more traditional collective bargaining concerns. Determination of educational mission and academic freedom were ranked fifth and sixth, respectively

The only significant difference by voting behavior occurred on the issue of faculty personnel policies. AFT voters differed significantly from AAUP voters with AFT voters ranking its importance and/or negotiability higher than did AAUP voters.

This lack of delineation between voters on the importance attached to bargainable issues may be a sign that images were better established and more important in the first Temple election than any real or imagined differences over substantive issues. There is impor-

tance, too, in the fact that only the negotiation of faculty personnel policies (promotion, tenure, and evaluation) brought out significant differences. Had significance occurred on the question regarding satisfaction, it might have lent credence to the idea that the AFT voters (who proved to be the point of difference) were less secure and sought unionization as a means of job security. But as significance occurred only under the desirability of negotiating, this hypothesis remains unsupported.

Attitude Toward Strikes by Voting Behavior

This question was intended to determine whether attitude about strikes differed according to voting behavior. Respondents were asked to rank four statements about strikes according to the extent to which they agreed with each statement (1 = most agreement, 4 = least agreement). The four statements, ranging from general unwillingness to strike through willingness to strike even when illegal, are listed in Table 20, according to their mean ranking. As expected, the statement "Strikes on the part of faculty members are generally undesirable and should be averted for the majority of grievances" ranked first, and the statement sanctioning an illegal strike was ranked last. All statements except the first revealed significant differences among people voting for opposing choices.

(2) Faculty members should utilize the strike as an appropriate sanction after other legal recourse to mediation, fact-finding, and arbitration have failed to resolve grievances. AFT voters were significantly more in agreement with this statement than were No Rep, AAUP, and NEA voters. The No Rep voters were in significantly less agreement with this statement than were AAUP and NEA voters (1 = most agreement, 4 = least agreement; see Table 21).

(3) The strike is an unprofessional sanction and under no circumstances should faculty members withhold their services. An antithesis to statement #2's thesis, this statement revealed a similar pattern, this time in reverse. No Rep voters were in significantly more agreement with this statement than were AFT voters.

(4) In cases where the breadth of disagreement between faculty members and the employer-negotiators is great, faculty should strike

even before satisfying Act 195 requirements for mediation, fact-finding, and arbitration. AFT voters were in significantly more agreement about this statement than AAUP and No Rep voters; NEA voters were in significantly less agreement with this statement than No Rep voters (see Table 21).

The general pattern on this question concerning the use of strikes appears quite consistent. AFT and No Rep voters continue to be significantly different from each other, with the AAUP and NEA voters somewhere in the middle. The two middle groups tend not to be significantly different from either end of the spectrum nor different from each other in their agreement or disagreement over the appropriate use of strikes. The reader should be cautioned that a ranking question forces relative judgments. Therefore, the data do not necessarily mean that AFT voters favor strikes, but rather that they are significantly more inclined in this manner than are No Rep voters.

The Viability of "No Representative"

I would have voted for the "No Representative" option if I thought it had a chance to win. There appears to be some degree of importance attached to whether or not faculty consider the choice of No Rep a viable one. The hypothesis was that since little organized opposition to collective bargaining surfaced during the campaign, those who might otherwise vote for No Rep would instead try to "pick a winner" or make a choice among equally unattractive alternatives. Put another way, to what extent did faculty perceive the election to be a choice among associations rather than an election to determine whether to unionize?

To shed some light on this question, respondents were asked whether they would have voted for No Rep if they thought it had a chance to win. The responses, which appear in Table 22, indicate that 28 percent of AAUP voters, 19 percent of NEA voters, 7 percent of AFT voters, or 15 percent of all of these voters would have cast a vote for No Rep if they thought it had a chance to win.

In order to estimate the impact these data would have had on the first election, the election results were recalculated three different ways. The first method assigned all "no answer" respondents (row 3, Table 22) on a proportionate basis to the yes and no categories. The second method assigned all "no answer" respondents to the no cate-

gory. The third method assigned all "no answer" respondents to the yes category.

The results indicated that no matter which method was used, the order in which each of the four options finished was the same. This order was as follows: (1) No Rep; (2) AFT, (3) NEA, (4) AAUP.

According to these data, the second or runoff election would have been between No Rep and the AFT, although under the third method of calculations No Rep might have achieved a first ballot majority. There never was a sustained effort in support of No Rep in the preelection campaign, however; but apparently an additional 15 percent of the faculty really preferred not to have collective bargaining at all. When added to the 17 percent who actually voted for No Representative this is an impressive figure.

Finally, it is clear that the AAUP was the major beneficiary of the failure of the no representative forces to mobilize. The AAUP finished second to the AFT in the first election, whereas they would have finished last in the projected election. Eventually, the AAUP won the election by capturing 90 percent of the No Rep vote on the second ballot, a finding that will be discussed in more detail later in this report.

Summary of First Election Results

The demographic data showed that in terms of age, academic affiliation, and service in other institutions of higher education, AFT voters and No Rep voters were closer to one another than to anyone else. In the sections on attitudes and perceptions of the associations and the situations that led to collective bargaining at Temple, however, AFT and No Rep voters consistently were at opposite poles, with NEA and AAUP voters holding the middle ground. In the middle position, NEA voters were sometimes closer to AFT than AAUP voters. AAUP voters were less often separated from No Rep voters. If voters had perceived No Rep as a viable choice, the second or runoff election would have been between No Rep and the AFT.

III: THE RUNOFF ELECTION

A winner in a collective bargaining election is not declared until either No Representative or an association has received a majority of the votes cast. Since this did not occur on the first ballot, the top two choices, the AFT and the AAUP, competed in a second or runoff election on December 6 and 7, 1972. The AAUP won. Part III is a discussion of the questionnaire data according to voting behavior in the second election.

The Open-Ended Responses by Voting Behavior

The respondents were asked to record what they considered the major issue in the second campaign. The responses, by voting behavior, appear below.

AAUP. Of the 106 responses, 39 (37 percent) expressed the issue in some form of "opposite": professional association vs. union (25), militance vs. conservatism (12), or, one that was particularly colorful, "the potential tyranny of the AFT vs. the almost certain inefficiency and naivete of the AAUP." Another large group of 20 (19 percent) claimed that the style of the AFT ("abrasive") and its willingness to strike was the main issue. Six others said the main issue was how to defeat AFT. Eight expressed the main issue in rather neutral terms such as the choice of an appropriate representative. Thirteen respondents reported that the question was who would "best" represent the faculty; most added that by this they meant without unnecessary militance or aggressiveness. Three respondents said that the main issue was financial.

AFT. Of 75 responses, 25 (33 percent) used opposing terms such as progressive vs. reactionary, militant vs. congenial, hard vs. soft. Another 18 agreed with AAUP supporters that the AFT image was "militant, undignified, and unprofessional" (although they did not indicate that they thought the image was accurate or fair). Only 8 mentioned the strike. Five indicated the AFT's willingness to strike as a reason for their support, while 3 said they thought the fear of a strike was the main issue. Nine said they thought the issue was who would

best and most effectively represent the faculty, while another 7 said the issue was clout. Three mentioned money as the main issue.

As in the first election, AFT supporters were more diffuse in their characterizations of the main issue. There was general agreement that AAUP's image was "professional," that AFT was more willing to strike, and that these two points were critical, especially to those who voted for AAUP.

First Election Voters for NEA and No Representative. Twenty-eight people who had voted for one of the "losers" on the first ballot made comments in this space. The general tenor of their remarks, whether they voted for AFT or AAUP in the second election, was one of disappointment. Several complained that the format of the first ballot worked against No Rep and one AAUP voter complained of AAUP tactics to make No Rep seem a sure loser. Those who voted for the AFT in the second election indicated that they did so because they believed forceful representation was necessary, while those who voted for AAUP indicated opposition to strikes and unions. One person who voted for NEA, then AAUP, said collective bargaining was not necessary because Temple was doing all it could for its faculty and that only the insecure wanted bargaining. Three people who went from No Rep to no vote said the election was a farce, while several others said it did not seem to make much difference.

First Election Voters for AFT and AAUP. Most of these voters "held the line"; understandably, their general comments were more partisan. Thirty-three indicated some opinion here. Four AAUP supporters felt the election was well managed, but 1 AFT supporter commented that no identification was required of voters. Surprisingly, several people in both groups felt that AFT lost more than AAUP won, with several remarking that AAUP seemed more congenial. Some were hopeful that bargaining would bring improvement in their lot, but just as many thought nothing would change. Several in both camps seemed uneasy with the polarization and conflict that developed, and 1 complained that it seemed all groups were against everything rather than for something.

Demographic Characteristics by Voting Behavior

Only 2 of the 10 demographic characteristics proved significant according to voting behavior: age and tenure status. Those who voted

for the AFT in the second election were significantly younger than those who voted for the AAUP (see Table 23) and were less likely to be tenured (see Table 24). (Tenure was not significantly different according to voting behavior in the first election, but academic affiliation and years of service at other institutions of higher education were.)

Association Descriptors

Of the eight descriptors in this section (see Table 7), six were significant in the first election. In the second election, the same six descriptors were significant according to voting behavior (see Table 25). Table 25 shows that of the six descriptors, four showed significant differences along straight "party" lines. On most professionally oriented, historical commitment to collective bargaining, greatest visibility in Pennsylvania, and greatest national visibility, AAUP voters checked their organization significantly more often than did AFT voters; AFT voters checked their organization significantly more often than AAUP voters did. On a fifth descriptor, most prestigious, the significant difference is still partisan, though it occurs only on those checking AAUP. Apparently, even AFT voters did not consider their organization a serious contender for that descriptor. The most interesting difference is, of course, the last descriptor, greatest lobbying potential in Harrisburg. Here the usual partisan differences showed; in addition, significantly more AAUP than AFT voters checked NEA.

Internal Versus External Governance Factors as Influences on Voting Behavior

The same four statements that ranked significantly different in the first election (see Table 16) proved different, according to voting behavior, in the second election (see Table 26). The significant statements, together with their rank order, are as follows ("1" equals most influential):

(1) *Internal agents* such as Temple's president and board of trustees have not responded to the needs and welfare of the Temple faculty.

(2) *The administrative staff* at Temple have far too much authority in the affairs which should be determined by the faculty.

(3) *The association* I voted for can best represent faculty interests in the state legislature and state government.

(4) *Greater attention* should be given to means other than collective bargaining for faculty self-government and sharing of decision making with Temple's president and board of trustees.

The first, second, and fourth ranked statements all were ranked more influential by AFT than AAUP voters. AAUP voters gave a significantly higher mean ranking to the statement which stressed alternatives to collective bargaining.

Satisfaction with Potentially Bargainable Issues

The first election revealed no statistical differences between voters for different associations on the degrees of satisfaction with potential collective bargaining issues (see Table 18). There were, however, two issues in the second election about which AFT voters and AAUP voters differed significantly. AFT voters gave a significantly lower mean ranking (they were less satisfied) to conditions of employment than did AAUP voters. AAUP voters gave a significantly lower mean ranking (they were less satisfied) to faculty personnel policies than did AFT voters.

Negotiability or Importance of Potentially Bargainable Issues

Table 28 shows that only two of the six issues were ranked significantly different according to voting behavior. AFT voters gave a signifciantly lower mean ranking (they regarded the issue as more important or negotiable) to faculty personnel policies than did AAUP voters. AAUP voters gave a significantly lower mean ranking to academic freedom than did AFT voters.

Attitude Toward Strikes by Voting Behavior

Four statements were presented about strikes, and the respondents were asked to rank them according to how much they were in agreement with the statements. In the first election, the mildest state-

ment, that strikes are generally undesirable, received the most agreement overall; furthermore, it was the only one of the four statements that did not show significant differences based upon voting behavior. The fact that three of the four did show significant differences was some indication that the strike was an important and discriminating issue. All four statements showed significant differences between AFT and AAUP voters in the second election (see Table 29).

AAUP voters gave significantly lower mean rankings (they were more in agreement with) to the statements that strikes are generally undesirable and constitute an unprofessional sanction than did AFT voters. AFT voters gave significantly lower mean rankings to statements saying the strike could be utilized after other legal recourse or even before satisfying legal requirements for mediation, fact-finding, and arbitration.

Summary of Runoff Election Results

Of the six major sections in the instrument, two, association descriptors and internal-external governance influences, showed the same significant differences, according to voting behavior in both elections. Academic affiliation and number of years service at other institutions of higher education were significantly different in the first election but not in the second; age was significantly different both times; tenure status was significantly different in the second election. In the section dealing with satisfaction with potentially negotiable issues, no significant differences were observed in the first election, but personnel policy and conditions of employment proved to be significantly different in the second election. In the section on importance of and desirability of negotiating potentially bargainable issues, personnel policy showed significant differences both the first and the second time, and in the second election it was joined by academic freedom. On opinions concerning strikes, three of the four statements were significantly different in the first election, while in the second election all four statements were significantly different according to voting behavior.

IV. VOTING BEHAVIOR IN BOTH ELECTIONS FOR THOSE WHO VOTED IN BOTH

Vote Switching in the Second Election

There were 298 respondents who voted in both elections. Table 30 shows that 98.8 percent of those who voted for the AAUP in the first election and 89.1 percent of those who voted for the AFT did not change their vote in the second election. Forty-eight percent of the NEA voters changed to the AFT and 52 percent changed to the AAUP. In the second election, the AAUP received 91.3 percent of the votes of those who originally cast a ballot for No Representative.

Because the distributions of voting behavior in the second election were significantly different (see Table 30), post hoc comparisons were computed. The only contrast which did not prove significantly different was between AAUP and No Rep first election voters. NEA voters split their votes in significantly different ways than did AAUP, AFT, and No Rep voters; AFT voters were different from NEA, AAUP, and No Rep voters.

The fact that 52 percent of the NEA voters eventually cast a ballot for the AAUP deserves additional comment. After the first election, the NEA affiliate's executive committee met with the executive committees of both the AFT and AAUP. On November 7, 1972, the NEA Executive Committee issued a unanimous endorsement of the AFT and urged its supporters to vote for the AFT. While the data in the survey do not speak to whether this endorsement changed any votes, it appears that it was not successful in delivering anywhere near the "entire voting bloc." The value of such endorsements remains undetermined.

NEA Voters Compared by Voting Behavior in the Second Election

In order to determine whether there were significant differences between those NEA voters who voted for the AFT and those who voted for the AAUP in the second election, the entire set of statistical tests were computed on the subgroup of NEA voters. The two groups were compared according to their voting behavior in the second election. The results are discussed below.

Demographic Characteristics by Voting Behavior

Not one of the 10 demographic characteristics of NEA voters was significantly different according to voting behavior in the second election.

Association Descriptors

Four of the eight descriptors demonstrated significant differences (see Table 31). Three of these were the descriptors that had been strongly contested as an image by at least two associations. That is, they were the descriptors where the image was not clear-cut: association with the greatest national visibility, association with the greatest visibility in Pennsylvania, and association with the greatest lobbying potential in Harrisburg. The fourth descriptor which showed significant differences between the two groups was association least likely to resort to a strike.

In the cases of national and state visibility, the differences between the two groups was not in their image of AFT but in their images of AAUP and NEA. In both cases, those people who voted for AAUP in the second election were significantly more inclined to see the descriptors as true of AAUP than were those who voted for AFT. In both cases, too, a significantly greater percentage of those eventually voting for AFT seemed to think that these descriptors were true of NEA.

NEA voters who voted for the AAUP were significantly more likely to have checked the descriptor, greatest lobbying potential in Harrisburg, as indicative of the AAUP than were those who voted for the AFT (14.3 percent to 0.00 percent). Not one of the NEA respondents who voted for the AFT thought that the AFT was least likely to strike.

Internal Versus External Governance Factors as Influences on Voting Behavior

Table 32 shows that the mean rankings of the election one NEA voters who eventually voted for the AFT or the AAUP differed significantly on two of six statements. AFT voters gave a lower mean ranking (they considered it more important) to "The association I voted for can best represent faculty interests in the state legislature and state government" than did AAUP voters. AAUP voters gave a sig-

nificantly lower mean ranking (they considered it more important) to the statement "Greater attention should be given to means other than collective bargaining . . . trustees" than did AFT voters. (The statements were ranked first and fifth respectively by AFT voters and fourth and fifth by AAUP voters.)

Satisfaction with Potentially Bargainable Issues

Table 33 shows that only one of the six issues provided significantly different mean rankings according to NEA voters' ballots in the second election. Those who voted for the AFT were significantly more satisfied (gave a lower mean ranking to) with academic freedom than were those who voted for the AAUP.

Negotiability or Importance of Potentially Bargainable Issues

There were no significant differences between NEA voters who voted for the AFT or the AAUP in the second election.

Attitude Toward Strikes by Voting Behavior

Table 34 shows that the mean rankings of three of the four statements concerning strikes were significantly different according to the association for which NEA voters cast a second election ballot. AAUP voters were significantly more in agreement (gave a significantly lower mean ranking to) that the strike is an unprofessional sanction than were AFT voters. AFT voters were significantly more in agreement (gave significantly lower mean rankings to) that the strike is "an appropriate sanction after other legal recourse" and that, under certain conditions, "Faculty should strike even before satisfying Act 195 requirements for mediation, fact-finding, and arbitration."

The AAUP won by gaining 91.3 percent of the No Rep vote and 52 percent of the NEA vote. There were no significant differences between NEA voters who voted for different associations in the second election on demographic characteristics and the negotiability of potentially bargainable issues. The significant differences on satisfaction with potentially bargainable issues were minimal. There were significant differences according to second election voting behavior on association characteristics, internal versus external governance, and opinions about the appropriateness of strikes.

V. DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

This report is a case study of one collective bargaining election. It is, of course, dangerous to generalize too freely from case studies. The study is, however, a replication of a research effort conducted on the fourteen-campus Pennsylvania State College and University 1971 election (Lozier and Mortimer 1974). There are data against which some "reasonable" comparisons can be made. The remainder of this report summarizes the results of this study and makes some general comparisons between the two studies.[6]

Demographic Characteristics by Voting Behavior

At Temple, age was the only demographic variable that proved significantly different according to voting behavior in both elections. AFT voters were younger than NEA and AAUP voters. No Rep voters had the least amount of experience in higher education and AFT voters in the second election were less likely to be tenured than AAUP voters.

Demographic differences were considerably more pronounced in the Pennsylvania State College election. NEA voters were significantly older, more tenured, more trained in education disciplines, more involved in teacher training, and had more experience in elementary and/or secondary schools than AAUP voters. The support for NEA came from those who were more cognizant of the tradition of state colleges as teacher's colleges. Such historical and cultural factors were not present at Temple in sufficient numbers to benefit substantially the NEA affiliate.

Association Descriptors

There was a high degree of consensus among both the Temple and state college faculties that the AAUP was the most prestigious,

[6] The election in the Pennsylvania State Colleges was settled on the first ballot with the NEA affiliate receiving 55.5 percent of the vote and the AAUP 35.4 percent. Between them, the AFT and No Rep received only 9.1 percent of the vote. The most pertinent contrasts, then, were between NEA and AAUP voters.

most professionally oriented, and least likely to strike. In both elections the AFT was considered the most union-oriented and most historically committed to collective bargaining. The AAUP had the greatest national visibility for state college voters (54.5 percent), whereas the AFT enjoyed this status (49.4 percent) at Temple; but neither won the election at these respective institutions.

The NEA affiliate at Temple did not rank first on any of the eight descriptors. To the extent these descriptors portray "reality," the NEA had no clear image at Temple. The NEA's strength in the state colleges lay in the fact that 91 percent of the voters thought it had the greatest visibility within Pennsylvania and 87 percent thought it had the greatest lobbying potential in Harrisburg. At Temple, the AFT ranked ahead of the NEA affiliate on both descriptors.

In both elections at Temple, the same six descriptors showed significant differences according to voting behavior. Where such differences occurred at Temple and in the state colleges a "halo effect" was apparent. The voters for a particular agent tended to perceive their choice as significantly more prestigious, etc., than other voters.

Internal Versus External Governance Factors as Influences on Voting Behavior

When asked to rank their relative concern about internal vs. external governance matters as influences on voting behavior, the Temple respondents indicated they were more concerned about internal matters. The AFT voters tended to reveal a stronger reaction against the Temple administration than No Rep voters and, in some cases, than AAUP voters. AFT voters gave significantly less support to the search for alternatives to collective bargaining.

The general results of the state college election were quite different from Temple. The faculty in the state colleges were more concerned about external governance matters. The NEA affiliate received its support from faculty members who were first seeking an effective representative of their interests in the state legislature and state government.

Satisfaction with and Desired Negotiability of Six Issues

The research at Temple revealed only two issues where the voters were significantly different on their satisfaction with potentially

bargainable issues. In the second election, AFT voters were less satisfied with conditions of employment than AAUP voters and AAUP voters were less satisfied with faculty personnel policies. On desired negotiability of these six issues, AFT voters ranked faculty personnel policies more negotiable than did AAUP voters, in both Temple elections.

The faculty in both studies indicated that they were most satisfied with academic freedom issues. Conditions of employment, faculty personnel policies, and financial benefits were ranked almost identically in that order in the middle ranges of satisfaction by both Temple and state college faculty. However, whereas the state college faculty members were least satisfied (i.e., ranked sixth) with the determination of educational policy, this issue was ranked as the second most satisfactory issue at Temple. Correspondingly, the least satisfactory issue at Temple—faculty participation in governance—was the third most satisfactory issue in the state colleges. These results appear on the surface to be consistent with the findings reported in the previous section regarding external versus internal governance factors as influences upon a faculty member's preference for a bargaining agent.

Respondents were requested to rank the same six issues according to their negotiability, with "1" representing the most negotiable issue. In both studies, financial benefits ranked first, conditions of employment second, faculty personnel policies third, and faculty participation in governance fourth. State college faculty ranked academic freedom fifth and determination of educational policy sixth, whereas the Temple faculty reversed these rankings. Those issues for which there was the least satisfaction—educational policy for the state colleges and faculty participation in governance at Temple—were not necessarily most negotiable, ranking sixth and fourth for the state colleges and Temple, respectively, in terms of their negotiability.

Attitude Toward Strikes

Attitude toward the strike was a discriminating variable. While all voters regarded the strike as generally undesirable, in both Temple elections and in the Pennsylvania State Colleges, AFT voters tended to be significantly less reluctant about it than No Rep and AAUP voters. There tended to be no significant differences in either case between NEA and AAUP voters in their attitude toward strikes.

Chance of No Rep to Win

There is substantial evidence to warrant a conclusion that AAUP's strategy of convincing the electorate that No Rep did not have a chance to win was crucial in determining the eventual winner at Temple (Katz 1974, p. 33). The survey data reveal that while only 17 percent voted for No Rep, an additional 15 percent would have voted for No Rep if they thought it had a chance to win. Additional evidence on this point is available from the open-ended responses. Approximately 35 percent of those respondents saw the main issue in the campaign as whether to adopt collective bargaining. When No Rep was removed from the ballot, 91 percent of its voters who voted in the second election cast their ballot for the AAUP.

The "No Rep does not have a chance" strategy was effective in a different way in the state college election. In that election, the respondents were asked if they would have voted for No Rep if they thought it had a chance to win. Because the AFT never campaigned seriously in that election, respondents also were asked if they would have voted for the AFT if they thought it had a chance to win. The results indicated that the NEA affiliate would have had to confront the AAUP in a runoff election if the faculty had voted their "conscience."

Generalizations Across Elections

In summary, it is possible to offer some generalizations across collective bargaining elections in two different situations. The consistent results in the two elections are as follows:

1. The AAUP is perceived as the most prestigious, most professionally oriented, and least likely to strike. The AFT is perceived as the most union-oriented and historically committed to collective bargaining. No association appears to be consistently perceived as having the greatest national visibility, the greatest visibility within Pennsylvania, or the greatest lobbying potential in Harrisburg.
2. Faculty in both institutions were most satisfied with academic freedom issues and were identical in their ranking of this and three other issues.
3. AFT voters were consistently less reluctant to indicate their willingness to consider a strike.

4. The "No Rep has no chance to win" strategy appears to have been effective in both campaigns, although in the state colleges it appears to have worked against the AAUP whereas at Temple it worked for the AAUP.

The differences between the two elections were as follows:

1. In the state colleges the demographic characteristics tended to draw distinctions between NEA and AAUP voters on such variables as age, tenure status, discipline, involvement in teacher training, and experience in elementary or secondary schools. There were few distinctions at Temple on these variables, although AFT voters were younger than NEA and AAUP voters.
2. State college respondents were more concerned about external governance matters whereas Temple respondents were more concerned about internal matters.

Appendix A:

Tables

TABLE 1

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ELECTION RESULTS

	Election Date			
	October 1972		December 1972	
Bargaining Agents	N	%	N	%
FCBA-PSEA-NEA[a]	280	.256	NA	NA
AAUP[b]	303	.278	626	.589
TUFF-AFT[c]	328	.300	437	.410
No Representative	183	.167	NA	NA
Voting Statistics				
Total Votes Counted	1094	1.001	1063	.999
Total Votes Cast	1168[d]	.8355	1080[e]	.773
Eligible Voters	1398	–	1398	–
Total Not Voting	230	.1645	318	.227

[a]Faculty Collective Bargaining Association-Pennsylvania State Education Association-National Education Association

[b]American Association of University Professors

[c]Temple University Faculty Federation-American Federation of Teachers

[d]Challenged Ballots 74, Invalid Ballots 0.

[e]Challenged Ballots 14, Invalid Ballots 3.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION COMPARED TO THE RESPONDENTS ON WHETHER A VOTE WAS CAST IN THE TWO ELECTIONS AT TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

	Population		Respondents	
	N	%	N	%
Voting Behavior		**October 1972 Election***		
Voted	1168	.836	339	.874
Did Not Vote	230	.164	49	.126
Total	1398	1.000	388[a]	1.000
		December 1972 Election**		
Voted	1080	.772	328	.841
Did Not Vote	318	.228	62	.159
Total	1398	1.000	390	1.000

[a]Two respondents did not answer the question.

*$\chi^2 = 4.1237$, df = 1, p = .05

**$\chi^2 = 10.4206$, df = 1, p = .05

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION'S VOTING BEHAVIOR COMPARED TO RESPONDENT VOTING BEHAVIOR IN TWO TEMPLE UNIVERSITY ELECTIONS

	Population		Respondents	
	N	%	N	%
Bargaining Agent	**October 1972 Election***			
FCBA-PSEA-NEA	280	.256	83	.245
AAUP	303	.278	94	.277
TUFF-AFT	328	.300	103	.304
No Representative	183	.167	59	.174
Total	1094	1.001	339	1.000
	December 1972 Election**			
AAUP	636	.589	194	.591
TUFF-AFT	437	.410	134	.408
Total	1073	.999	328	.999

*x^2 = .2734, df = 3
**x^2 = .0089, df = 1

TABLE 4

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN AGES BY VOTING BEHAVIOR

Voting Behavior	Mean Age
FCBA-NEA	42.902
AAUP	42.571
TUFF-AFT	38.600
No Representative	39.339
Total/Average	40.882

Source	Mean Square	df	F-ratio	p
Between Groups	418.62	3	4.007	.008
Within Groups	104.46	328		

TABLE 5

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN YEARS OF SERVICE AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION BY VOTING BEHAVIOR

Voting Behavior	Mean Years
FCBA-NEA	4.160
AAUP	4.457
TUFF-AFT	2.765
No Representative	2.051
Total/Average	3.443

Source	Mean Square	df	F-ratio	p
Between Groups	99.16	3	4.091	≈.007
Within Groups	24.24	330		

TABLE 6

CROSSTABULATION OF ACADEMIC AFFILIATION AND VOTING BEHAVIOR

	Voting Behavior									
	FCBA-NEA		AAUP		TUFF-AFT		No Rep		Row Total	
Academic Affiliation	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Arts-Humanities	26	32.5	27	33.8	22	27.5	5	6.3	80	100.0
Business	9	32.1	4	14.3	9	32.1	6	21.4	28	100.0
Education	21	29.6	14	19.7	24	33.8	12	16.9	71	100.0
Sciences	14	17.3	27	33.3	16	19.8	24	29.6	81	100.0
Social Sciences	7	14.9	9	19.1	21	44.7	10	21.3	47	100.0
Library, Offices	6	19.4	12	38.7	11	35.5	2	6.5	31	100.0
Total/Average	83	24.6	93	27.5	103	30.5	59	17.5	338	100.0

$x^2 = 37.779$, df = 15, p = 0.001

TABLE 7

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS INDICATING THE ASSOCIATION WHICH BEST EXEMPLIFIES EACH OF EIGHT GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

	Bargaining Agent			
	FCBA-NEA	AAUP	TUFF-AFT	Total
General Characteristics	%	%	%	%
Most Prestigious	6.3	89.8	3.9	100.0
Most Union-Oriented	3.8	1.9	94.2	100.0
Most Professionally Oriented	11.0	84.1	4.9	100.0
Historical Commitment to Collective Bargaining	9.2	7.1	83.6	100.0
Greatest National Visibility	24.6	26.0	49.4	100.0
Greatest Visibility Within Pennsylvania	38.6	12.8	48.6	100.0
Least Likely to Resort to a Strike	15.6	78.9	5.5	100.0
Greatest Lobbying Potential in Harrisburg	43.6	9.1	47.3	100.0

TABLE 8

CROSSTABULATION OF FACULTY SELECTION OF MOST PRESTIGIOUS ASSOCIATION AND VOTING BEHAVIOR

	Voting Behavior									
	FCBA-NEA		AAUP		TUFF-AFT		No Rep		Total	
Most Prestigious	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
AAUP	63	82.9	79	98.8	79	86.8	41	91.1	262	89.7
FCBA-NEA	13	17.1	0	0	4	4.4	2	4.4	19	6.5
TUFF-AFT	0	0	1	1.3	8	8.8	2	4.4	11	3.8
Column Total	76	100.0	80	100.1	91	100.0	45	99.9	292	100.0

$x^2 = 11.845$,[a] df = 3, p = .008

[a]Because the expected frequencies for FCBA-NEA and TUFF-AFT were 1 or less in two columns, the two associations were collapsed and resultant chi-square value reported here is from a 4 x 2 table. S. Siegel, *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956), p. 178, recommends that, for chi-square tests with degrees of freedom greater than one, an accurate result is not obtainable if more than 20 percent of the cells have an expected frequency of less than five. The same holds true if one or more cells have an expected frequency of less than one.

TABLE 9

CROSSTABULATION OF FACULTY SELECTION OF MOST UNION-ORIENTED ASSOCIATION AND VOTING BEHAVIOR

Most Union-Oriented	Voting Behavior									
	FCBA-NEA		AAUP		TUFF-AFT		No Rep		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TUFF-AFT	75	93.8	82	91.1	98	98.0	53	98.1	308	95.1
FCBA-NEA	4	5.0	6	6.7	1	1.0	1	1.9	12	3.7
AAUP	1	1.3	2	2.2	1	1.0	0	0.0	4	1.2
Column Total	80	100.1	90	100.0	100	100.0	54	100.0	324	100.0

$x^2 = 6.220$,[a] df = 3, p = .1014

[a]See footnote a for Table 8.

TABLE 10

CROSSTABULATION OF FACULTY SELECTION OF MOST PROFESSIONALLY ORIENTED ASSOCIATION AND VOTING BEHAVIOR

Most Professionally Oriented	Voting Behavior									
	FCBA-NEA		AAUP		TUFF-AFT		No Rep		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
AAUP	54	70.1	89	95.7	78	78.8	49	92.5	270	83.9
FCBA-NEA	22	28.6	2	2.2	9	9.1	3	5.7	36	11.2
TUFF-AFT	1	1.3	2	2.2	12	12.1	1	1.9	16	5.0
Column Total	77	100.0	93	100.0	99	100.0	53	100.1	322	100.1

$x^2 = 25.117$,[a] df = 3, $p < 0.001$

[a]See footnote a for Table 8.

TABLE 11

CROSSTABULATION OF FACULTY SELECTION OF HISTORICAL COMMITMENT TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ASSOCIATION AND VOTING BEHAVIOR

Historical Commitment to Collective Bargaining	Voting Behavior									
	FCBA-NEA		AAUP		TUFF-AFT		No Rep		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TUFF-AFT	60	80.0	63	76.8	94	94.9	38	82.6	255	84.4
FCBA-NEA	12	16.0	9	11.0	1	1.0	5	10.9	27	8.9
AAUP	3	4.0	10	12.2	4	4.0	3	6.5	20	6.6
Column Total	75	100.0	82	100.0	99	99.9	46	100.0	302	99.9

$x^2 = 13.178$,[a] df = 3, p = 0.004

[a]See footnote a for Table 8.

TABLE 12

CROSSTABULATION OF FACULTY SELECTION OF GREATEST NATIONAL VISIBILITY ASSOCIATION AND VOTING BEHAVIOR

Greatest National Visibility	Voting Behavior									
	FCBA-NEA		AAUP		TUFF-AFT		No Rep		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TUFF-AFT	29	36.7	34	41.5	69	70.4	23	46.9	155	50.3
AAUP	21	26.6	29	35.4	14	14.3	13	26.5	77	25.0
FCBA-NEA	29	36.7	19	23.2	15	15.3	13	26.5	76	24.7
Column Total	79	100.0	82	100.1	98	100.0	49	99.9	308	100.0

$x^2 = 28.57130$, df = 6, $p < 0.001$

TABLE 13

CROSSTABULATION OF FACULTY SELECTION OF GREATEST VISIBILITY WITHIN PENNSYLVANIA ASSOCIATION AND VOTING BEHAVIOR

Greatest Visibility Within Pennsylvania	Voting Behavior									
	FCBA-NEA		AAUP		TUFF-AFT		No Rep		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TUFF-AFT	25	34.2	30	39.0	65	69.9	20	44.4	140	48.6
FCBA-NEA	40	54.8	32	41.6	24	25.8	17	37.8	113	39.2
AAUP	8	11.0	15	19.5	4	4.3	8	17.8	35	12.2
Column Total	73	100.0	77	100.1	93	100.0	45	100.0	288	100.0

$x^2 = 31.68489$, df = 6, $p < 0.001$

TABLE 14

CROSSTABULATION OF FACULTY SELECTION OF LEAST LIKELY TO RESORT TO STRIKE ASSOCIATION AND VOTING BEHAVIOR

Least Likely to Resort to Strike	Voting Behavior									
	FCBA-NEA		AAUP		TUFF-AFT		No Rep		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
AAUP	64	81.0	79	87.8	72	72.7	43	76.8	258	79.6
FCBA-NEA	11	13.9	9	10.0	20	20.2	9	16.1	49	15.1
TUFF-AFT	4	5.1	2	2.2	7	7.1	4	7.1	17	5.2
Column Total	79	100.0	90	100.0	99	100.0	56	100.0	324	99.9

$x^2 = 6.96385$, df = 3, $p = 0.0731$

TABLE 15

CROSSTABULATION OF FACULTY SELECTION OF GREATEST LOBBYING POTENTIAL IN HARRISBURG ASSOCIATION AND VOTING BEHAVIOR

Greatest Lobbying Potential in Harrisburg	Voting Behavior									
	FCBA-NEA		AAUP		TUFF-AFT		No Rep		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TUFF-AFT	18	24.3	21	29.2	75	78.9	20	43.5	134	46.7
FCBA-NEA	51	68.9	39	54.2	19	20.0	19	41.3	128	44.6
AAUP	5	6.8	12	16.7	1	1.1	7	15.2	25	8.7
Column Total	74	100.0	72	100.1	95	100.0	46	100.0	287	100.0

$x^2 = 72.41739$, df = 6, $p < 0.001$

TABLE 16

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF RANKED STATEMENTS EXPRESSING RESPONDENT ATTITUDES ABOUT INTERNAL VS. EXTERNAL GOVERNANCE INFLUENCES UPON THEIR VOTE BY VOTING BEHAVIOR

Statement[a]	Respondent				
	All Respondents	FCBA-NEA	AAUP	TUFF-AFT	No Rep
1. Internal agents such as Temple's president and board of trustees have not responded to the needs and welfare of the Temple faculty.*	2.6318	2.701	2.718	2.191	3.548
2. The administrative staff at Temple have far too much authority in the affairs which should be determined by the faculty.†	3.1124	3.328	3.028	2.708	4.000
3. The state government and legislature have not responded to the needs of either the Pennsylvania state-related institutions or the faculty of these institutions.‡	3.1434	2.910	3.183	3.281	3.161
4. The association I voted for can best represent faculty interests in the state legislature and state government.#	3.4767	3.134	3.915	3.169	4.097
5. Greater attention should be given to means other than collective bargaining for faculty self-government and sharing of decision making with Temple's president and board of trustees.**	4.0078	4.090	3.493	5.180	1.645
6. Temple's president and board of trustees do not have sufficient authority to respond to the needs and welfare of the faculty at Temple and other state-related institutions.††	4.6279	4.836	4.662	4.472	4.548

[a]Scale: 1 = most important; 6 = least important.

*F = 6.4531	†F = 6.0629	‡F = .07884	#F = 5.9073	**F = 45.3381	††F = 0.9993
$p < .001$	$p \approx .001$	$p > .25$	$p \approx .001$	$p < .001$	$p > .25$
df = 257	df = 257	df = 257	df = 257	df = 257	df = 257

TABLE 17

POST HOC COMPARISON OF RANKED STATEMENTS EXPRESSING RESPONDENT ATTITUDES ABOUT INTERNAL VS. EXTERNAL GOVERNANCE INFLUENCES UPON THEIR VOTE

Statement	Respondent			
1. Internal agents such as Temple's president and board of trustees have not responded to the needs and welfare of the Temple faculty.	TUFF-AFT 2.191	FCBA-NEA 2.701	AAUP 2.718	No Rep 3.548
2. The association I voted for can best represent faculty interests in the state legislature and state government.	FCBA-NEA 3.134	TUFF-AFT 3.169	AAUP 3.915	No Rep 4.097
3. Greater attention should be given to means other than collective bargaining for faculty self-government and sharing of decision-making with Temple's president and board of trustees.	No Rep 1.645	AAUP 3.493	FCBA-NEA 4.090	TUFF-AFT 5.180
4. The administrative staff at Temple have far too much authority in the affairs which should be determined by the faculty.	TUFF-AFT 2.708	AAUP 3.028	FCBA-NEA 3.328	No Rep 4.000
5. Temple's president and board of trustees do not have sufficient authority to respond to the needs and welfare of the faculty at Temple and other state-related institutions.	TUFF-AFT 4.472	No Rep 4.548	AAUP 4.662	FCBA-NEA 4.836
6. The state government and legislature have not responded to the needs of either the Pennsylvania state-related institutions or the faculty of these institutions.	FCBA-NEA 2.910	No Rep 3.161	AAUP 3.183	TUFF-AFT 3.281

Note: The underlining notation is used to indicate those differences between or among means which are not significant.

TABLE 18

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF POTENTIAL COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ISSUES RANKED FROM MOST TO LEAST SATISFIED BY VOTING BEHAVIOR

Issue	Respondent: All Respondents	FCBA-NEA	AAUP	TUFF-AFT	No Rep
1. Academic Freedom*	1.8112	1.676	1.923	1.911	1.638
2. Determination of Educational Policy†	3.2902	3.225	3.346	3.100	3.660
3. Conditions of Employment‡	3.4021	3.577	3.436	3.122	3.617
4. Faculty Personnel Policies#	3.9196	4.000	3.692	4.200	3.638
5. Financial Benefits**	4.2063	4.085	4.154	4.456	4.000
6. Faculty Participation in Governance††	4.3601	4.437	4.410	4.211	4.447

*F = 1.0262	†F = 1.4572	‡F = 1.7334	#F = 2.1913	**F = 1.0546	††F = 0.4896
p ≈ .25	p ≈ .25	p ≈ .10	p ≈ .10	p > .25	p > .25
df = 285	df = 285	df = 285	df = 285	df = 285	df = 285

TABLE 19

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF POTENTIALLY NEGOTIABLE ISSUES RANKED FROM MOST TO LEAST IMPORTANT OR NEGOTIABLE BY VOTING BEHAVIOR

Issue	Respondents: All Respondents	FCBA-NEA	AAUP	TUFF-AFT	No Rep
1. Financial Benefits*	1.8382	1.765	1.920	1.736	2.024
2. Conditions of Employment†	2.9870	2.941	2.907	3.069	3.048
3. Faculty Personnel Policies‡	3.2316	3.235	3.613	2.920	3.190
4. Faculty Participation in Governance#	3.7574	3.676	3.760	3.747	3.905
5. Determination of Educational Policy**	4.5919	4.706	4.373	4.690	4.595
6. Academic Freedom††	4.5919	4.676	4.427	4.839	4.238

*F = 0.5872	†F = 0.2750	‡F = 3.3267	#F = 0.2328	**F = 0.8638	††F = 1.7311
p > .25	p > .25	p ≈ .020	p > .25	p > .25	p ≈ .10
df = 271	df = 271	df = 271	df = 271	df = 271	df = 271

TABLE 20

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF RANKED STATEMENTS EXPRESSING RESPONDENT ATTITUDES ABOUT FACULTY USE OF THE STRIKE BY VOTING BEHAVIOR

Statement	Respondents				
	All Respondents	FCBA-NEA	AAUP	TUFF-AFT	No Rep
1. Strikes on the part of faculty members are *generally undesirable* and should be averted for the majority of grievances.*	1.6730	1.676	1.536	1.753	1.738
2. Faculty members should utilize the strike as an appropriate sanction *after other legal recourse* to mediation, fact-finding, and arbitration have failed to resolve grievances.†	1.9049	1.789	2.101	1.457	2.643
3. The strike is an unprofessional sanction and *under no circumstances* should faculty members withhold their services.‡	2.8667	2.986	2.667	3.531	1.714
4. In cases where the breadth of disagreement between faculty members and the employer negotiators is great, faculty should strike *even before* satisfying Act 195 requirements for mediation, fact-finding, and arbitration.#	3.551	3.549	3.696	3.259	3.905

*$F = 1.6222$, $p \approx .25$, $df = 262$

†$F = 25.6615$, $p < .001$, $df = 262$

‡$F = 40.9114$, $p < .001$, $df = 262$

#$F = 10.7283$, $p < .001$, $df = 262$

TABLE 21

POST HOC COMPARISON OF RANKED STATEMENTS EXPRESSING RESPONDENT ATTITUDES ABOUT FACULTY USE OF THE STRIKE

Statement	Respondent			
1. Strikes on the part of faculty members are *generally undesirable* and should be averted for the majority of grievances.	AAUP	FCBA-NEA	No Rep	TUFF-AFT
	1.536	1.676	1.738	1.753
2. Faculty members should utilize the strike as an appropriate sanction *after other legal recourse* to mediation, fact-finding and arbitration have failed to resolve grievances.	TUFF-AFT	FCBA-NEA	AAUP	No Rep
	1.457	1.789	2.101	2.643
3. The strike is an unprofessional sanction and *under no circumstances* should faculty members withhold their services.	No Rep	AAUP	FCBA-NEA	TUFF-AFT
	1.714	2.667	2.986	3.531
4. In cases where the breadth of disagreement between faculty members and the employer-negotiators is great, faculty should strike *even before* satisfying Act 195 requirements for mediation, fact-finding, and arbitration.	TUFF-AFT	FCBA-NEA	AAUP	No Rep
	3.259	3.549	3.696	3.905

Note. The underlining notation is used to indicate those differences between or among means which are not significant.

TABLE 22

ANSWERS TO THE QUESTION: WOULD YOU HAVE VOTED FOR THE NO REPRESENTATIVE OPTION IF YOU THOUGHT IT HAD A CHANCE TO WIN? BY VOTING BEHAVIOR

	Voting Behavior									
	FCBA-NEA		AAUP		TUFF-AFT		No Rep		Total	
Answer	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	16	19	27	28	7	7	0	0	50	15
No	51	62	49	51	67	65	0	0	167	49
No Answer	16	19	20	21	29	28	59	100	124	36
Column Total	83	100	96	100	103	100	59	100	341	100

TABLE 23

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN AGE BY VOTING BEHAVIOR IN THE SECOND ELECTION

Voting Behavior	Mean Age
TUFF-AFT	39.48
AAUP	42.77
Total/Average	41.44

Source	Mean Square	df	F-ratio	p
Between Groups	835.06	1	7.72	.006
Within Groups	108.21	319		

TABLE 24

CROSSTABULATION OF TENURE AND VOTING BEHAVIOR IN THE SECOND ELECTION

	Voting Behavior					
	TUFF-AFT		AAUP		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Tenured	57	43.5	111	58.7	168	52.5
Not Tenured	74	56.5	78	41.3	152	47.5
Total/Average	131	40.9	189	59.1	320	100.0

$x^2 = 6.589$, df = 1, p = .01

TABLE 25

CROSSTABULATION OF EIGHT ASSOCIATION CHARACTERISTICS WITH VOTING BEHAVIOR IN THE SECOND ELECTION

Characteristics	Voting Behavior		
	TUFF-AFT	AAUP	Total
1. Most Prestigious*			
FCBA-NEA	10.8	3.7	6.7
AAUP	81.7	94.5	89.1
TUFF-AFT	7.5	1.8	4.2
2. Most Union Oriented†			
FCBA-NEA	2.3	4.3	3.5
AAUP	0.8	2.7	1.9
TUFF-AFT	96.9	92.9	94.6
3. Most Professionally Oriented‡			
FCBA-NEA	16.5	9.2	12.2
AAUP	74.0	89.7	83.3
TUFF-AFT	9.4	1.1	4.5
4. Historical Commitment to Collective Bargaining#			
FCBA-NEA	6.3	11.7	9.3
AAUP	1.6	10.5	6.6
TUFF-AFT	92.2	77.8	94.1
5. Greatest National Visibility**			
FCBA-NEA	24.0	23.1	23.5
AAUP	14.7	34.9	26.2
TUFF-AFT	61.2	42.0	50.3
6. Greatest Visibility in Pennsylvania††			
FCBA-NEA	36.8	39.7	38.4
AAUP	4.0	20.5	13.2
TUFF-AFT	59.2	39.7	48.4
7. Least Likely-to Strike‡‡			
FCBA-NEA	12.3	15.7	14.3
AAUP	83.1	78.9	80.6
TUFF-AFT	4.6	5.4	5.1
8. Greatest Lobbying Potential in Harrisburg##			
FCBA-NEA	35.7	51.3	44.2
AAUP	0.8	13.8	7.9
TUFF-AFT	63.5	34.9	47.8

*χ^2 = 11.88932 df = 2 p = 0.0026

†χ^2 = 2.54626 df = 2 p > 0.2500

‡χ^2 = 17.31880 df = 2 p = 0.0002

#χ^2 = 12.77527 df = 2 p = 0.0017

**χ^2 = 16.78709 df = 2 p = 0.001

††χ^2 = 19.95480 df = 2 p < 0.001

‡‡χ^2 = 0.086375 df = 2 p < 0.6493

##χ^2 = 30.35048 df = 2 p < 0.001

TABLE 26

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF RANKED STATEMENTS EXPRESSING RESPONDENT ATTITUDES ABOUT INTERNAL VS. EXTERNAL GOVERNANCE INFLUENCES UPON THEIR VOTE BY VOTING BEHAVIOR IN THE SECOND ELECTION

Statement	Respondent		
	All Respondents	TUFF-AFT	AAUP
1. Internal agents such as Temple's president and boarrd of trustees have not responded to the needs and welfare of the Temple faculty.*	2.6574	2.252	3.000
2. The administrative staff at Temple have far too much authority in the affairs which should be determined by the faculty.†	3.1076	2.817	3.353
3. The state government and legislature have not responded to the needs of either the Pennsylvania state-related institutions or the faculty of these institutions.‡	3.1394	3.235	3.059
4. The association I voted for can best represent faculty interests in the state legislature and state government.#	3.4183	2.965	3.801
5. Greater attention should be given to means other than collective bargaining for faculty self-government and sharing of decision making with Temple's president and board of trustees.**	4.0040	5.043	3.125
6. Temple's president and board of trustees do not have sufficient authority to respond to the needs and welfare of the faculty at Temple and other state-related institutions.††	4.6733	4.687	4.662

*F = 15.2315	†F = 7.4889	‡F = 0.8737	#F = 18.2204	**F = 85.5319	††F = 0.0250
df = 250	df = 250	df = 250	df = 250	df = 250	df = 250
p = < .001	p ≈ .007	p > 0.25	p < .001	p < .001	p > .25

TABLE 27

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF POTENTIAL COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ISSUES RANKED FROM MOST TO LEAST SATISFIED BY VOTING BEHAVIOR IN THE SECOND ELECTION

Issue	Respondent			Statistical Data		
	All Respondents	TUFF-AFT	AAUP	F	p	df
1. Academic Freedom	1.8934	1.885	1.899	0.0079	$>.25$	271
2. Determination of Educational Policy	3.3309	3.1688	3.447	2.1496	$\approx.10$	271
3. Conditions of Employment	3.3640	3.133	3.528	4.5705	$\approx.033$	271
4. Faculty Personnel Policies	3.8971	4.168	3.704	6.2186	$\approx.013$	271
5. Financial Benefits	4.1985	4.354	4.088	1.6345	$\approx.25$	271
6. Faculty Participation in Governance	4.3051	4.272	4.314	0.0200	$>.25$	271

TABLE 28

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF POTENTIALLY NEGOTIABLE ISSUES RANKED FROM MOST TO LEAST IMPORTANT OR NEGOTIABLE BY VOTING BEHAVIOR IN THE SECOND ELECTION

Statement	Respondent			Statistical Data		
	All Respondents	TUFF-AFT	AAUP	F	p	df
1. Financial Benefits	1.8636	1.704	1.974	2.4979	$\approx.10$	263
2. Conditions of Employment	2.9924	2.954	3.019	0.1658	$\approx.25$	263
3. Faculty Personnel Policies	3.2197	2.926	3.423	8.1122	$\approx.005$	263
4. Faculty Participation in Governance	3.7424	3.824	3.686	0.6690	$>.25$	263
5. Academic Freedom	4.5833	4.907	4.359	7.5422	$\approx.006$	263
6. Determination of Educational Policy	4.5985	4.685	4.538	0.6454	$>.25$	263

TABLE 29

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF RANKED STATEMENTS EXPRESSING RESPONDENT ATTITUDES ABOUT FACULTY USE OF THE STRIKE BY VOTING BEHAVIOR IN THE SECOND ELECTION

Statement	Respondent			Statistical Data		
	All Respondents	TUFF-AFT	AAUP	F	p	df
1. Strikes on the part of faculty members are *generally undesirable* and should be averted for the majority of grievances.	1.6914	1.838	1.589	9.2836	≈.003	255
2. Faculty members should utilize the strike as an appropriate sanction *after other legal recourse* to mediation, fact-finding, and arbitration have failed to resolve grievances.	1.8945	1.438	2.212	61.5408	<.001	255
3. The strike is an unprofessional sanction and *under no circumstances* should faculty members withhold their services.	2.8867	3.486	2.470	74.4705	<.001	255
4. In cases where the breadth of disagreement between faculty members and the employer-negotiators is great, faculty should strike *even before* satisfying Act 195 requirements for mediation, fact-finding, and arbitration.	3.5273	3.238	3.728	32.9184	<.001	255

TABLE 30

CROSSTABULATION OF VOTING BEHAVIOR IN THE FIRST AND SECOND ELECTIONS FOR THOSE WHO VOTED IN BOTH ELECTIONS

Voting Behavior in the Second Election	Voting Behavior in the First Election									
	FCBA-NEA		AAUP		TUFF-AFT		No Rep		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TUFF-AFT	36	48.0	1	1.2	82	89.1	4	8.7	123	41.3
AAUP	39	52.0	84	98.8	10	10.9	42	91.3	175	58.7
Total	75	100.0	85	100.0	92	100.0	46	100.0	298	100.0

$x^2 = 164.85$, df = 3, p = .001

TABLE 31

CROSSTABULATION OF EIGHT ASSOCIATION CHARACTERISTICS OF FCBA-NEA VOTERS WHO VOTED IN THE SECOND ELECTION BY VOTING BEHAVIOR

Characteristics	Voting Behavior				Statistical Data		
	TUFF-AFT		AAUP				
	N	%	N	%	x^2	df	p
1. Most Prestigious					1.25351	1	0.2629
FCBA-NEA	8	24.2	4	11.1			
AAUP	25	75.8	32	88.9			
TUFF-AFT	0	0	0	0			
2. Most Professionally Oriented					1.32489	2	0.5156
FCBA-NEA	11	32.4	10	27.8			
AAUP	22	64.7	26	72.2			
TUFF-AFT	1	2.9	0	0			
3. Historical Commitment					0.26928	2	0.8740
FCBA-NEA	6	18.2	6	16.2			
AAUP	1	3.0	2	5.4			
TUFF-AFT	36	78.8	29	78.4			
4. Greatest National Visibility					6.51031	2	0.0386
FCBA-NEA	16	45.7	8	21.6			
AAUP	6	17.1	15	40.5			
TUFF-AFT	13	37.1	14	37.8			
5. Greatest Visibility in Pennsylvania					6.65563	2	0.0359
FCBA-NEA	22	66.7	14	41.2			
AAUP	1	3.0	7	20.6			
TUFF-AFT	10	30.3	13	38.2			
6. Greatest Lobbying Potential in Harrisburg					6.55885	2	0.0376
FCBA-NEA	27	79.4	20	57.1			
AAUP	0	0.0	5	14.3			
TUFF-AFT	7	20.6	10	28.6			
7. Most Union-Oriented					2.11558	2	0.3472
FCBA-NEA	3	8.6	1	2.6			
AAUP	0	0.0	1	2.6			
TUFF-AFT	32	91.4	36	94.7			
8. Least Likely to Strike					12.07790	2	0.0024
FCBA-NEA	1	2.9	9	24.3			
AAUP	34	97.1	24	64.9			
TUFF-AFT	0	0.0	4	10.8			

TABLE 32

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF RANKED STATEMENTS EXPRESSING FCBA-NEA VOTER ATTITUDES ABOUT INTERNAL VS. EXTERNAL GOVERNANCE INFLUENCES UPON THEIR VOTE BY VOTING BEHAVIOR IN THE SECOND ELECTION

Statement	Respondent			Statistical Data		
	All Respondents	TUFF-AFT	AAUP	F	p	df
1. Internal agents such as Temple's president and board of trustees have not responded to the needs and welfare of the Temple faculty.	2.6630	2.5517	2.7742	$(-0.55)^2$ .3025	0.588	58
2. The state government and legislature have not responded to the needs of either the Pennsylvania state-related institutions or the faculty of these institutions.	2.9722	3.1379	2.8065	$(0.83)^2$ .6889	0.413	58
3. The association I voted for can best represent faculty interests in the state legislature and state government.	2.9917	2.2414	3.7419	$(-4.49)^2$ 20.1601	0.000	58
4. The administrative staff at Temple have far too much authority in the affairs which should be determined by the faculty.	3.3465	3.2414	3.4516	$(-0.50)^2$ .25	0.620	58
5. Greater attention should be given to means other than collective bargaining for faculty self-government and sharing of decision making with Temple's president and board of trustees.	4.2203	4.8276	3.6129	$(2.75)^2$ 7.5625	0.008	58
6. Temple's president and board of trustees do not have sufficient authority to respond to the needs and welfare of the faculty at Temple and other state-related institutions.	4.8065	5.000	4.6129	$(1.30)^2$ 1.69	0.200	58

TABLE 33

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF POTENTIAL COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ISSUES RANKED FROM MOST TO LEAST SATISFIED BY FCBA-NEA VOTERS BY THEIR VOTING BEHAVIOR IN THE SECOND ELECTION

Issue	Respondent			Statistical Data		
	All Respondents	TUFF-AFT	AAUP	F	p	df
1. Academic Freedom	1.6956	1.4483	1.9429	$(-2.17)^2$ 4.7089	0.034	62
2. Determination of Educational Policy, e.g., curriculum, admissions	3.2552	3.3103	3.2000	$(0.26)^2$ .0676	0.796	62
3. Conditions of Employment, e.g., policies on sabbaticals, teaching loads, parking	3.5902	3.5517	3.6286	$(-0.20)^2$ .04	0.844	62
4. Faculty Personnel Policies, e.g., promotion, tenure, evaluation	3.9251	3.7931	4.0571	$(-0.69)^2$ .4761	0.491	62
5. Financial Benefits	4.0463	4.2069	3.8857	$(0.74)^2$ .5476	0.461	62
6. Faculty Participation in Governance	4.4877	4.6897	4.2857	$(1.22)^2$ 1.4884	0.226	62

TABLE 34

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF RANKED STATEMENTS EXPRESSING FCBA-NEA VOTER ATTITUDES ABOUT FACULTY USE OF THE STRIKE BY THEIR VOTING BEHAVIOR IN THE SECOND ELECTION

Statement	Respondent			Statistical Data		
	All Respondents	TUFF-AFT	AAUP	F	p	df
1. Strikes on the part of faculty members are *generally undesirable* and should be averted for the majority of grievances.	1.6875	1.833	1.559	2.4374	$>.05$	63
2. Faculty members should utilize the strike as an appropriate sanction *after other legal recourse* to mediation, fact-finding, and arbitration have failed to resolve grievances.	1.7500	1.467	2.000	7.5018	$\approx.01$	63
3. The strike is an unprofessional sanction and *under no circumstances* should faculty members withhold their services.	3.0625	3.400	2.765	8.7999	$\approx.01$	63
4. In cases where the breadth of disagreement between faculty members and the employer negotiators is great, faculty should strike *even before* satisfying Act 195 requirements for mediation, fact-finding, and arbitration.	3.5000	3.300	3.676	4.7082	$\approx.05$	63

References

Aussieker, Bill and Garbarino, Joseph W. "Measuring Faculty Unionism: Quantity and Quality." *Industrial Relations* 12(1973): 117–24.

Begin, James. "Faculty Bargaining in 1973: A Loss of Momentum?" *Journal of the College and University Personnel Association* 12 (April 1974): 74–81.

Election Order. PERA-R-1123-E and PERA-R-1137-E.

Emmet, Thomas. *Postsecondary Public Employment Legislation: A Status Report–1974.* Washington: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, 1974.

Katz, Ellis. "Faculty Stakes in Collective Bargaining: Expectations and Realities." *Encountering the Unionized University,* edited by Jack Schuster, pp. 27–46. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Lozier, G. Gregory and Mortimer, Kenneth P. *Anatomy of a Collective Bargaining Election in Pennsylvania's State-Owned Colleges.* University Park, Pa.: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1974.

Millman, Stephen D. and Toombs, William. *The Quality of Graduate Studies: Pennsylvania and Selected States.* University Park, Pa.: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1972.

Moore, John W. *Pennsylvania Community College Faculty Attitudes Toward Collective Negotiations.* University Park, Pa.: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1971.

Mortimer, Kenneth P.; Johnson, Mark D., and Weiss, David A. "No Representative Victories in Faculty Collective Bargaining Elections." Unpublished manuscript, 1974.

Roose, Kenneth D. and Andersen, C. J. *A Rating of Graduate Programs.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970.

Semas, Philip W. "Three Collective Bargaining Groups Vie for Faculty Vote at Temple University." The *Chronicle of Higher Education,* October 5, 1972, pp. 1;3.

"Where College Faculties Have Chosen or Rejected Collective Bargaining Agents." The *Chronicle of Higher Education,* June 10, 1974, p. 24.

Notes on the Author

KENNETH P. MORTIMER holds a Ph.D. from the University of California, Berkeley. He was employed by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at Berkeley, where he participated in project research concerned with academic decision making. His major publications are on faculty participation in academic governance, faculty collective bargaining, and academic accountability. In addition to his center appointment, Dr. Mortimer is Associate Professor of Higher Education in the College of Education.

Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University

The Center for the Study of Higher Education was established in January 1969 to study higher education as an area of scholarly inquiry and research. Dr. G. Lester Anderson, its director, is aided by a staff of twenty, including five full-time researchers, and a cadre of advanced graduate students and supporting staff.

The Center's studies are designed to be relevant not only to the University and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, but also to colleges and universities throughout the nation. The immediate focus of the Center's research falls into the broad areas of governance, graduate and professional education, and occupational programs in two-year colleges.

Research reports, monographs, and position papers prepared by staff members of the Center can be obtained on a limited basis. Inquiries should be addressed to the **Center for the Study of Higher Education, 101 Rackley Building, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, 16802.**

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE FROM THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Monographs

CUPIR: Cooperative Utilization of Private Institutional Resources: A Multifaceted Thrust for the Private Junior Colleges, S. V. Martorana, Eileen P. Kuhns, Richard M. Witter, and Alan J. Sturtz, October 1974 (jointly with the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges).

Innovative Programs in Education for the Professions, Larry L. Leslie, June 1974.

Insights into Higher Education: Selected Writings of CSHE, 1969–73, Vol. III, Curriculum, Graduate and Professional Education, Finance, Winter 1974.

Insights into Higher Education: Selected Writings of CSHE, 1969–73, Vol. II, Community College and Postsecondary Occupational Education, Winter 1974.

Insights into Higher Education: Selected Writings of CSHE, 1969–73, Vol. I, Governance, Winter 1974.

Anatomy of a Collective Bargaining Election in Pennsylvania's State-Owned Colleges, G. Gregory Lozier and Kenneth P. Mortimer, February 1974.

Variability in Faculty Perception of the Legitimacy of Decision Making at Nine Pennsylvania Institutions, David W. Leslie, November 1973.

Human Services Occupations in the Two-Year College: A Handbook, Theodore E. Kiffer and Martha Burns, May 1972.

Institutional Self-Study at The Pennsylvania State University, Kenneth P. Mortimer and David W. Leslie (eds.), December 1970.

Numbered Reports

The Higher Education Faculty of Pennsylvania: Selected Characteristics, Larry L. Leslie and James Creasy, July 1974, Report No. 24.

The Comm-Bacc Study: Postbaccalaureate Activities of Degree Recipients from Pennsylvania Institutions 1971–72, William Toombs, August 1973, Report No. 23.

Students and Unions, Neil S. Bucklew, July 1973, Report No. 22.

Compensatory Education in Two-Year Colleges, James L. Morrison and Reynolds Ferrante, April 1973, Report No. 21.

Pennsylvania's "State-Owned" Institutions: Some Dimensions of Degree Output, William Toombs and Stephen D. Millman, February 1973, Report No. 20.

The Trend Toward Government Financing of Higher Education Through Students: Can the Market Model be Applied?, Larry L. Leslie, January 1973, Report No. 19. (Out of print.)

The Rationale for Various Plans for Funding American Higher Education, Larry L. Leslie, June 1972, Report No. 18.

Collective Bargaining: Implications for Governance, Kenneth P. Mortimer and G. Gregory Lozier, July 1972, Report No. 17.

Productivity and the Academy: The Current Condition, William Toombs, May 1972, Report No. 16. (Out of print.)

Exceptional Graduate Admissions at The Pennsylvania State University, Manuel G. Gunne and Larry L. Leslie, March 1972, Report No. 15.

The Quality of Graduate Studies: Pennsylvania and Selected States, Stephen D. Millman and William Toombs, February 1972, Report No. 14.

Reports 1–13 out of print.

Conference Reports

State-Local Agency and Community College Cooperation for Community Improvement: A Conference of State and Local Officials in the Middle Atlantic States, S. V. Martorana and James O. Hammons (eds.), December 1974.

The Fifth Annual Pennsylvania Conference on Postsecondary Occupational Education, Angelo C. Gillie (ed.), June 1974.

The Fourth Annual Pennsylvania Conference on Postsecondary Occupational Education, Angelo C. Gillie (ed.), August 1973.

Bibliographies

Community College Staff Development: An Annotated Bibliography, Terry H. Wallace, April 1975.

The University and the Arts: A Preliminary Annotated Bibliography, Ann Kieffer Bragg, May 1974.

Selected Bibliography in Higher Education, September 1969; revised April 1972; revised August 1974.

Occasional Papers

Larry L. Leslie, *A Case for Low Tuition*, November 1974.

Ann Kieffer Bragg and G. Lester Anderson, *Journals of Education for the Professions: A Preliminary Study*, May 1974.

Ralph L. Boyers in collaboration with Robert E. Sweitzer, *Collective Bargaining In Pennsylvania: A Summary of Collective Bargaining Agreements*, August 1973.

Naomi V. Ross, *Community College Teacher Preparation Programs in the U.S.: A Bibliography with Introductory Notes*, August 1972.